



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



90

184
—
28

Bd. Apr. 1917

HARVARD LAW LIBRARY

Gift of
James Munson Barnard
and
Augusta Barnard

RECEIVED Nov. 27, 1917



From Stereograph, Copyright 1901, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

Theodore Roosevelt

American peace congress. 1st, New York, 1907.

11/16

10 138

ct°

PROCEEDINGS
OF
THE NATIONAL ARBITRATION
AND PEACE CONGRESS

NEW YORK, APRIL 14TH TO 17TH, 1907

EDITED BY THE SECRETARY

23 WEST 44TH STREET
NEW YORK
1907

PEACE

Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error
There were no need of arsenals and forts.

The warrior's name would be a name abhorred!
And every nation that should lift again
Its hand against a brother, on its forehead
Would wear forevermore the curse of Cain.

Down the dark future, through long generations,
The echoing sounds grow fainter and then cease:
And like a bell, with solemn sweet vibrations,
I hear once more the voice of Christ say, "Peace!"

Peace! and no longer from its brazen portals
The blast of war's great organ shakes the skies!
But, beautiful as songs of the immortals,
The holy melodies of love arise.

*Henry Wadsworth Longfellow,
"The Arsenal at Springfield."*

NOV 27 1914

CONTENTS

Officers	5
Executive Committee.....	6
Introduction	7
FIRST SESSION—Choral Service.	
Scripture Reading.....	
Address by Dr. Emil G. Hirsch.....	13
" Bishop Henry C. Potter.....	19
" Monsignor M. J. Lavelle.....	20
" Archbishop John M. Farley.....	22
SECOND SESSION—Opening Meeting.	
Address by Mayor George B. McClellan.....	27
Letter from President Roosevelt.....	30
Address by Secretary of State Elihu Root.....	34
" Governor Charles E. Hughes.....	47
" President Andrew Carnegie.....	51
THIRD SESSION—International Views of the Peace Movement.	
Address by Baron d'Estournelles de Constant.....	53
" Secretary of Commerce and Labor Oscar S. Straus.....	62
" Prof. Hugo Münsterberg.....	65
" Dr. Ernst Richard.....	70
" William T. Stead.....	74
" Col. Sir Robert Cranston.....	77
" "Maarten Maartens".....	79
" Sir Robert S. Ball.....	80
" William Jennings Bryan.....	86
FOURTH SESSION—The Relation of Women to the Peace Movement.	
Address by Lucia Ames Mead.....	98
" Ellen M. Henrotin.....	98
" Mary E. Woolley.....	97
" Mrs. Frederick Nathan.....	101
" Jane Addams.....	108
" William Archer.....	110
Letter from Julia Ward Howe.....	117
Address by May Wright Sewall.....	120
FIFTH SESSION—Commercial and Industrial Aspects of the Peace Movement.	
Address by Marcus M. Marks.....	124
" Baron d'Estournelles de Constant.....	126
" Secretary Oscar S. Straus.....	124
" James W. Van Cleave.....	132
" Hon. Nahum J. Bacheider.....	145
" Hon. John Barrett.....	149
" Edwin Ginn.....	152
" William McCarroll.....	157
SIXTH SESSION—Young People's Meeting.	
Address by Dr. William H. Maxwell.....	162
" Prof. Henry Turner Bailey.....	164
" Dr. Nathan C. Schaeffer.....	168
" Charles Sprague Smith.....	170
" Baron d'Estournelles de Constant.....	175
Letter from Dr. Edward Everett Hale.....	179
Address by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise.....	180
" Dr. James J. Walsh.....	183
" Senorita Carolina Huidobro.....	186
" William T. Stead.....	191
SEVENTH SESSION—University Meeting.	
Address by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler.....	198
" Dr. John Rhys.....	200
" Rev. E. S. Roberts.....	208
" Dr. John H. Finley.....	206
" Dr. Felix Adler.....	210
" Jane Addams.....	212
" Edwin D. Mead.....	216
EIGHTH SESSION—Labor Meeting.	
Address by Joseph E. Buchanan.....	223
Resolutions of the American Federation of Labor.....	224
Address by Terence V. Powderly.....	226
" James J. Murphy.....	229
" Leonora O'Reilly.....	232
" John S. Whalen.....	239
" Algernon S. Crapsey.....	239
" Samuel Gompers.....	247
" William T. Stead.....	253

CONTENTS—Continued

CONFERENCE FOR PEACE WORKERS.

Address by	Elizabeth Powell Bond.....	267
" "	Hannah J. Bailey.....	271
" "	Mrs. Harry Hastings.....	275
" "	Carrie Chapman Catt.....	281
" "	Rev. Anna Howard Shaw.....	285
" "	Sevasti N. Callisperi.....	288
" "	May Wright Sewall.....	292

CONFERENCE OF DELEGATES.

Address by	Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood.....	295
Resolutions	of the National Arbitration and Peace Congress.....	298
Remarks by	Hon. Richard Bartholdt.....	299
" "	Chancellor Henry M. MacCracken.....	301
" "	Dr. Samuel J. Barrows.....	304
" "	Dr. J. Leonard Levy.....	307
" "	309
" "	311
" "	312
" "	313
" "	314
" "	316
Resolutions	Board of Trade.....	316
Remarks by	317
" "	318
" "	319
" "	320
" "	321
" "	322
" "	323

NINTH SESSION—The Legislative and Judicial Aspects of the Peace Movement.

Flag Presentation by	Richmond Pearson Hobson.....	326
Address by	President Andrew Carnegie.....	329
" "	Hon. Seth Low.....	330
" "	Hon. Richard Bartholdt.....	332
" "	Judge William W. Morrow.....	336
" "	Hon. John W. Foster.....	340
" "	Senor Diego Mendoza.....	342
" "	Judge George Gray.....	349
" "	William Jennings Bryan.....	353

BANQUET AT HOTEL ASTOR.

Address by	President Andrew Carnegie.....	361
" "	Earl Grey.....	362
" "	Senor D. Enrique C. Creel.....	369
" "	Rt. Hon. James Bryce.....	371
" "	Dr. Edward Everett Hale.....	376
Presentation of the Cross of the Legion of Honor to Mr. Carnegie.	382
Address by	Samuel Gompers.....	385
" "	President Charles W. Eliot.....	388
" "	William Jennings Bryan.....	390

BANQUET AT THE WALDORF-ASTORIA.

Address by	Hon. Seth Low.....	394
" "	Baron d'Estournelles de Constant.....	398
" "	Prof. Kuno Francke.....	401
" "	William Jennings Bryan.....	405
" "	Archbishop John Ireland.....	410
" "	Senor D. Enrique C. Creel.....	413
" "	Prof. John Bassett Moore.....	415
" "	Col. Sir Robert Cranston.....	420
" "	Dr. Lyman Abbott.....	422

Other Meetings	426
Historical Note	429
Resolutions	432
Letters and Telegrams	437
Foreign Guests	440
Subscribers	447
Disagreements	449

ILLUSTRATIONS

PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT.....	<i>Frontispiece</i>
	FACING PAGE
ANDREW CARNEGIE	5
CHORAL SERVICE.....	II
"GOOD-WILL AMONG MEN".....	27
GROUP I	47
HON. ELIHU ROOT	
GOVERNOR CHARLES E. HUGHES	
HON. OSCAR S. STRAUS	
HON. SETH LOW	
HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT	
GROUP II	76
COL. SIR ROBERT CRANSTON	
W. T. STEAD	
DR. JOHN RHYS	
SIR WILLIAM HENRY PREECE, F.R.S.	
SIR ROBERT BALL, F.R.S.	
GROUP III.....	87
MRS. MAY WRIGHT SEWALL	
MISS JANE ADDAMS	
MRS. ELLEN M. HENROTIN	
MISS MARY E. WOOLLEY	
SENORITA CAROLINA HUIDOBRO	
MRS. LUCIA AMES MEAD	
MRS. HANNAH J. BAILEY	
MRS. JULIA WARD HOWE.. .	117
YOUNG PEOPLE'S MEETING.....	163
BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT.....	176
GROUP IV	204
PRES. CHARLES W. ELIOT	
BISHOP HENRY C. POTTER	
REV. DR. LYMAN ABBOTT	
PRES. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER	
ARCHBISHOP JOHN M. FARLEY	
GROUP V.....	223
HON. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN	
HON. NAHUM J. BACHELDER	
SAMUEL GOMPERS	
HON. JOHN BARRETT	
WILLIAM MCCARROLL	

ILLUSTRATIONS—*Continued*

	FACING PAGE
A PEACE CONGRESS AUDIENCE.....	264
GROUP VI.....	295
HON. JOHN W. FOSTER	
ARCHBISHOP JOHN IRELAND	
PROF. HUGO MÜNSTERBERG	
DR. WILLIAM H. MAXWELL	
EDWIN GINN	
SEÑOR DIEGO MENDOZA	
PRESENTATION OF THE PEACE FLAG TO MR. CARNEGIE.....	327
BANQUET INVITATION	361
GROUP VII.....	370
HIS EXCELLENCY EARL GREY	
HIS EXCELLENCY DON ENRIQUE C. CREEL	
HIS EXCELLENCY JAMES BRYCE	
SIR EDWARD ELGAR	
J. M. W. VAN DER POORTEN SCHWARTZ ("MAARTEN MAARTENS")	
THE BANQUET, HOTEL ASTOR	394
DR. EDWARD EVERETT HALE	414
GROUP VIII—THE VICE-PRESIDENTS.....	429
HON. WILLIAM H. TAFT	
HON. GEORGE B. CORTELYOU	
HON. GEORGE VON L. MEYER	
HON. CHARLES T. BONAPARTE	
HON. JAMES R. GARFIELD	
HON. JAMES WILSON	
HON. VICTOR L. METCALF	
GROUP IX—THE VICE-PRESIDENTS	447
JUDGE DAVID J. BREWER	
MAYOR GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN	
ROBERT TREAT PAINE	
HON. ANDREW D. WHITE	
JOHN MITCHELL	
ALBERT K. SMILEY	
HON. ALTON B. PARKER	
GROUPS X AND XI.....	478
THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	

From Stereograph, Copyright 1907, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

Andrew Carnegie

OFFICERS

ANDREW CARNEGIE, *President.*

Vice-Presidents:

HON. ANDREW D. WHITE, Member First Hague Conference.
HON. SETH LOW, Member First Hague Conference.
Judge GEORGE GRAY, Member Hague Permanent Court.
HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT, M.C., President American Arbitration Group.
ALBERT K. SMILEY, Founder Mohonk Arbitration Conference.
ROBERT TREAT PAINE, President American Peace Society.
HON. ALTON B. PARKER, President American Bar Association.
SAMUEL GOMPERS, President American Federation of Labor.
JOHN MITCHELL, President United Mine Workers of America.
HON. GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN, Mayor of New York.
MORRIS K. JESUP, President New York Chamber of Commerce.
HON. CHARLES E. HUGHES, Governor of New York State.
Judge DAVID J. BREWER, United States Supreme Court.
HON. GEORGE B. CORTELYOU, Secretary of the Treasury.
HON. WILLIAM H. TAFT, Secretary of War.
HON. CHARLES J. BONAPARTE, Attorney-General.
HON. GEORGE VON L. MEYER, Postmaster-General.
HON. VICTOR H. METCALF, Secretary of the Navy.
HON. JAMES R. GARFIELD, Secretary of the Interior.
HON. JAMES WILSON, Secretary of Agriculture.
HON. OSCAR S. STRAUS, Secretary of Commerce and Labor.
HON. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN, Lincoln, Nebraska.

ROBERT ERSKINE ELY, *Secretary.*

GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY, *Treasurer.*

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Chairman: Prof. SAMUEL T. DUTTON, Teachers' College, Columbia University.

Secretary: ROBERT ERSKINE ELY, Director League for Political Education.

NEW YORK.

HAYNE DAVIS, American Secretary of the International Conciliation Committee.

RALPH M. EASLEY, Chairman Executive Council of the National Civic Federation.

HAMILTON HOLT, Managing Editor of *The Independent*.

Prof. GEORGE W. KIRCHWEY, Dean Columbia University Law School.

HENRY M. LEIPZIGER, Supervisor of Lectures, Board of Education.

Rev. FREDERICK LYNCH, Pastor Pilgrim Congregational Church.

MARCUS M. MARKS, Chairman Conciliation Committee, New York Civic Federation.

JOHN E. MILHOLLAND.

Prof. JOHN BASSETT MOORE, Columbia University.

Mrs. FREDERICK NATHAN.

Miss MARY J. PIERSON.

ERNST RICHARD, President German-American Peace Society.

CHARLES SPRAGUE SMITH, Director People's Institute.

Mrs. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER, Society for Ethical Culture.

Mrs. HENRY VILLARD.

EDWIN D. MEAD, Boston, Chairman Executive Committee International Peace Congress, 1904.

BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD, Boston, Secretary American Peace Society.

MAHLON N. KLINE, Philadelphia.

STANLEY R. YARNALL, Philadelphia.

JAMES B. REYNOLDS, Washington.

WILLIAM CHRISTIE HERRON, Cincinnati.

Rev. JENKIN LLOYD JONES, Chicago, Pastor All Souls' Church.

Rabbi J. LEONARD LEVY, Pittsburg.

DANIEL SMILEY, Mohonk Arbitration Conference.

H. C. PHILLIPS, Secretary Mohonk Arbitration Conference.

Financial Secretary: SHERMAN M. CRAIGER

Executive Officer: THEODORE HARDEE

Office Secretary: MARY B. CLEVELAND

Introduction and Summary

The National Arbitration and Peace Congress has been called "the greatest gathering ever held in advocacy of the abolition of war as a means of settling international disputes, and the most important non-political gathering ever held in this country for any purpose."

The suggestion that the first National Peace Congress in America meet in New York in the Spring of 1907, came from Mr. Edwin D. Mead and Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood of Boston. Mr. Mead was the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the International Peace Congress which assembled in Boston in October, 1904. Dr. Trueblood has been the Secretary of the American Peace Society for many years. The success of the Boston Congress, the long and effective work of the Mohonk Arbitration Conferences and of the leading Peace Societies in influencing public sentiment, encouraged the friends of the Peace movement in New York to assume the task suggested to them.

The first step toward the successful issue of the Congress was taken when Mr. Andrew Carnegie consented to be its President. The presidency of Mr. Carnegie was of immense service in every respect. The feeling toward him of the members of the Congress and of the adherents of the Peace cause on this continent and abroad was symbolized by Baron d'Estournelles de Constant in the act of conferring upon him the cross of the Legion of Honor at the closing banquet. A large number of distinguished men from several European countries had been invited by Mr. Carnegie to be present at the dedication of the Carnegie Institute in Pittsburgh on April 11th. The date of the Congress was so fixed that it closely followed this event, and the attendance of nearly all of these representatives of foreign nations was therefore secured.

The latest recipient of the Nobel Prize, President Roosevelt, was in cordial sympathy with the Congress and gave to it his earnest support, as was shown by his letter. Every member of his Cabinet was a Vice-President of the Congress and two Cabinet officers were among the speakers.

Those who were responsible for the Congress determined that while it should stand uncompromisingly for the highest ideals, at the same time it should be intensely practical in tone rather than Utopian. In view of the approaching Hague Conference, it was earnestly hoped that the addresses delivered and the resolutions passed would be of a character to assure the delegates at The Hague, especially those from this country, of the strong sympathy and support of the great mass of the American people in the movement for a definitely advanced Peace Program. The Congress was to stand for every inch of progress which can be made ~~now~~ toward the goal of International Peace. Peace was to be regarded as a practical business proposition, as well as a noble ideal.

The hopes of the officers of the Congress in this respect were realized. There were more delegates representing Chambers of Commerce, Boards of Trade and similar organizations of business men than from almost

any other single class of organizations, and probably more business men of high standing and representing all branches of trade and industry participated in the Congress than had ever before attended and taken part in any educational or philanthropic gathering.

Labor as well as capital, the vast agricultural interests of the nation as well as the commercial and manufacturing interests, were represented. Among the speakers were the President of the American Federation of Labor, who spoke for the two and a half million wage-earners in the ranks of organized labor; the President of the National Association of Manufacturers, representing three thousand manufacturing establishments in which millions of dollars are invested; and the Master of the National Grange, representing thirty thousand local organizations of farmers.

It was this intensely practical temper on the part of the delegates, both men and women, which led to the passing of the Resolutions summing up the purposes and convictions of the Congress. These resolutions have been characterized by the press of the United States substantially without dissent as thoroughly practical, business-like and realizable.

In order that the magnitude and impressiveness of the Congress may be appreciated, a few facts are here given:

The names of nearly 10,000 persons were received who were regularly appointed as the official delegates of institutions, organizations and societies of all kinds. There were in actual attendance at the Congress 1,253 delegates who registered at the headquarters. A considerable number of delegates present failed to register. These registered delegates came from thirty-nine states and territories. The far south and the Pacific coast were well represented as well as the nearer sections of the country. For example, nine delegates came from Alabama, two from Texas, two from Oklahoma, five from Wisconsin, two from Montana, four from California. From the New England and middle states there were large delegations. Massachusetts sent sixty-three persons, Connecticut sixty-one, and so on. There were representatives from seventeen or more foreign countries, including all of the great powers and many of the smaller nations of Europe, and also India, China and Japan. In the western hemisphere, the various provinces of Canada and also Mexico, Central America and South America were represented.

Special invitations to appoint delegates were sent in the name of the various sub-committees, to groups of organizations as follows: Commercial bodies; labor unions; farmers' granges; churches and other religious organizations; Peace Societies; ethical, reform and philanthropic societies; colleges, universities and other educational institutions; learned societies; women's organizations; patriotic societies. The medical and legal professions, journalism and literature, the fine arts and the drama were represented on the committees by some of their foremost leaders.

The Governors of States and the mayors of cities were invited, and many came. Invitations in the name of the legislative committee to members of both Houses of Congress and of the State Legislatures were in many cases accepted. The judiciary committee enlisted the sympathy and co-operation of federal and state judges. A remarkable press com-

mittee was formed, members of which were the editors-in-chief of all the important daily newspapers in New York City, the editors of nearly all of the important weekly and monthly journals, and the managers of all of the news associations.

There participated in the Congress prominent representatives of the chief religious denominations, Hebrew and Christian, Catholic and Protestant, orthodox and liberal, and also of the ethical societies and free-thought organizations. The Cardinal and two of the Archbishops of the Roman Catholic Church, Bishops of the Episcopal and Methodist Churches, and leaders in the other great religious bodies were actively connected with the Congress.

Delegates were appointed by a large majority of the four hundred colleges and universities of the land and many of these were in attendance at the meeting. The Governor of New York State appointed a committee of fifteen from both houses of the State Legislature to represent that body at the Congress, and all but two members of this committee attended some of its sessions.

The register of the Congress and its committees showed that there were enrolled among its membership and supporters two men who had been candidates for the Presidency of the United States, eight Cabinet officers, ten United States Senators, nineteen members of the House of Representatives, four Justices of the Supreme Court, twelve State Chief Justices, nine State Governors, sixty New York editors, thirty labor leaders, ten mayors, eighteen college and university presidents, twenty State Superintendents of Public Instruction, and forty bishops.

It is estimated that the total attendance at the seven meetings in Carnegie Hall, at the Business Men's meeting at Hotel Astor, the Labor meeting at Cooper Union, the conferences, the two banquets, the three luncheons, the receptions and the over-flow meetings amounted to considerably over 40,000. Never before in its history was Carnegie Hall filled to its full capacity three times in one day, in the morning, afternoon and evening, by audiences gathered for any one educational or philanthropic purpose. Especially worthy of mention were the Children's meeting, at which were gathered between four and five thousand children and teachers, representing the six hundred thousand pupils in the public schools of New York City, and also to some extent the schools of neighboring cities; and the Women's meeting, at which were delegates representing hundreds of thousands of American women connected with colleges, churches, clubs, reform, educational and charitable organizations from one end of the country to the other. The interest fittingly culminated in the two great banquets held simultaneously at the close of the Congress, at Hotel Astor and the Waldorf-Astoria, and arranged by Mr. Russell and Mr. de Lima.

A word must be said as to the preparatory work for the Congress. Under the auspices of the New York Peace Society meetings were held, during the preceding three months, in the churches of New York and vicinity, for the purpose of presenting the Peace cause. On the Sunday on which the Congress opened, April 14, sermons were preached and

addresses delivered in advocacy of International Peace in every city in the United States of over five thousand inhabitants, and in many of the smaller cities, towns and villages. The sympathy and co-operation of the press of the country was of immense value. In order that the plans for the Congress might be known and understood, three dinners were given in February and March, one by the New York Peace Society to the editors of New York; one by Mr. William H. Taylor to the City Editors and the Congress Committee, and one to the Reporters and the Committee by Mr. John D. Higgins. The daily newspapers of the metropolis gave an unprecedented amount of space to the gatherings, and most of the addresses were published either in full or in part, or commented upon by twelve thousand newspapers, and weekly and monthly periodicals of all kinds in the United States.

The spirit which animated all who were in any way connected with the Congress and who were present at its meetings, was remarkable. There was universal enthusiasm, earnestness and friendliness. It was felt that the Congress platform should be a free one in the sense that entire agreement in details on the part of the speakers was not expected or even desired. There was entire liberty of utterance. The striking result of this was, that beneath occasional superficial differences which helped to give vitality to the meetings, there was intense fundamental agreement.

The officers of the Congress wish to express their thanks to all who in any degree contributed to its success; to the speakers; to the members of all the committees; to the other workers, both those regularly employed and the volunteers; to the subscribers to the fund to meet the expenses, without whose aid this gathering would have been impossible; to the representatives of the press; to the clergymen and religious leaders of all kinds; and by no means last, to the women of the committees representing various women's organizations, who added much to the cumulative effect of the proceedings.

The especial attention of all into whose hands this volume comes, is invited to the Resolutions which were passed. These Resolutions and the other action taken embody the idea that the work of the Peace Congress is to be permanent and steadily enlarging. The day has come, not merely for occasional and sporadic gatherings, however large and enthusiastic, in the interest of the Peace movement, but for steady, out-reaching, progressive work which will never cease until the end in view shall be reached. The Peace cause henceforth takes on a new aspect. It is now a popular cause. The overwhelming mass of the people of the United States representing every creed, class, party and occupation, have proved emphatically and beyond question that they have a profound desire that war between nations should cease. Public sentiment, not merely in America, but in the whole world, is more and more the real sovereign. To focus and intensify public sentiment on this subject and to bring it to effective expression in action, is the work before us. The promoters of the first National Arbitration and Peace Congress have a strong faith that this task will be accomplished.

R. E. E.

From Stereograph, Copyright 1897, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.
CHORAL SERVICE, CARNEGIE HALL, SUNDAY EVENING, APRIL 1908

FIRST SESSION CHORAL SERVICE

CARNEGIE HALL

Sunday Evening, April Fourteenth, at 8.15

BISHOP POTTER Presiding

RESPONSIVE READING FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES

CONDUCTED BY REV. CHARLES E. JEFFERSON, D.D.

God reigneth over the nations;
He hath prepared his throne for judgment.

*And he will judge the world in righteousness;
He will minister judgment to the peoples in uprightness.*

He hath showed strength with his arm;
He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their heart.

*He hath put down princes from their thrones,
And he hath exalted them of low degree.*

He delighteth not in the strength of the horse;
He hath no pleasure in the thews of a man.

The Lord hath pleasure in them that fear him.

He will bring forth justice to the nations;
He will bring forth justice in truth.

*He will not fail nor faint, till he have set justice in the earth;
And the isles shall wait for his law.*

Arise, O Lord; let the nations be judged in thy sight.

*Put them in fear, O Lord;
Let the nations know themselves to be but men.*

Through the arrogance of the wicked the poor is oppressed.
The wicked praise God for the success of their greed;
They say in their heart: God hath forgotten;
He hideth his face, he will never see it.

*Arise, O God, lift up thine hand to right the oppressed,
That man, who is of the earth, may be terrible no more.*

I will hear what God, the Lord, will speak;

For he will speak peace unto his people.

He shall judge the people with righteousness,
And the poor with justice.

*He shall redeem their soul from oppression and violence;
And precious shall their blood be in his sight.*

Is not this the fast that I have chosen, saith the Lord,—
To loose the fetters of injustice; to untie the bands of violence;

*To set at liberty those who are crushed; to burst every yoke
asunder?*

If from the midst of thee thou remove the yoke,
The pointing finger, and the speech of mischief,—

*Then shall thy light rise in darkness,
And thy gloom shall be as the noonday.*

The eyes of those who see shall not be closed;
The ears of those who hear shall hearken;
The tongue of the stammerers shall speak plainly.
No more shall the fool be called noble,
Nor the knave any more be named gentle.

*The noble deviseth noble things,
And in noble things will he continue.*

He who walketh righteously and speaketh uprightly,
Who despiseth the gain of oppressions,
Who stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood,
And closeth his eyes from looking on evil,—

*Fastnesses of rocks shall be his stronghold;
He shall abide on impregnable heights.*

Rest in the Lord, wait patiently for him;
Fret not thyself because of the wicked who prospereth in his way.
For yet a little while and the wicked shall not be;
Yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and he shall not be;

For the Lord loveth justice, and forsaketh not his saints.

Justice shall dwell in the wilderness,
And righteousness shall abide in the fruitful field;

*And the work of righteousness shall be peace,
And the effect of righteousness, quietness and confidence forever.*

And God shall judge between the nations,
And arbitrate for many peoples;

He shall make their officers peace, and their rulers righteousness;

And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
And their spears into pruning hooks;
Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
Neither shall they learn war any more.

BISHOP POTTER :

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN : Mr. Carnegie was to have presided at this meeting. Whether he has forgotten it, or got lost, I cannot say. I hope he has forgotten it, for Father Lavelle and I were both equally shocked the other day to see a list of the twenty-eight righteous men in Pittsburg, in which Mr. Carnegie's name figured, but neither your Bishop of Pittsburg (turning to Monsignor Lavelle) nor mine!

Under these circumstances I am asked first of all to introduce the first speaker of this evening, the Rev. Rabbi Hirsch, of the Sinai Temple in Chicago, and of the Chicago University. (Applause.)

The Advent of the Plough

DR. EMIL G. HIRSCH

Battle cradled Judah's early poetry, like the youthful strains of the awakening national consciousness among other peoples, running in melodies singing of gory victories, and sounding the crash of clashing swords, the whirl and stir of flying arrows. It is the mighty "God of War" whom it invokes and proclaims, and to read the significance of the Universe's revolving and changeful sceneries the Hebrew bard's lyre borrows symbol and sign from camp and contest. Stars are an army sent forth in nightly raid to defeat the stormcloud's daring minions. Tide and tempest, roaring sea and ravenous abyss, are giant warriors leaping to the fray. Thus mythology and the nascent nation's vivid memories of recent feuds and broils vie with each other to lend glamour to the horrors of the man-wasting battleground.

But in the noontide fullness of the nation's maturity Judah's muse and ecstasy gives a vision of purer and softer tints and tones. They sing of peace. They prophesy of swords turned into ploughshares. They picture God enthroned as Judge over the dwellers of His footstool. His decisions render superfluous the appeal to arms. The art of war is forgotten in consequence. Not as one destined to snatch his laurel from a torrent of blood, but as one waving the palm undefiled by grime of murder, they name and hail the future ruler of their nation "Prince of Peace."

The consecration of Israel's prophetic assurance is upon us. The glad day of its fulfillment is nearing. Let them doubt who will. Ours is the fervent faith that vindicates the forevision.

What old fable told of Titan parent devouring his own offspring, in inverted sequence we know to be the fate of war. The children of war devour their progenitor. Every device and every invention which the warlike spirit has cradled have contributed to hold war itself in greater restraint. Old scrap iron are the proud floating fortresses constructed only a decade ago. The dreadnoughts of to-day will be regarded as puerile toys to-morrow. They have filled torpedo and projectile with explosives of terrible potentialities of havoc. Armors are pierced with as great ease as though they were glued together of paper. But while shipyards are teeming with thousands of toilers intent on forging the steel ramparts of the treacherous deep, from the quiet laboratory of an experimenter emanates the fuse that reduces turrets and steel cuirass to impotent makeshift. Mercenaries used to be the sons of war. Later only a small percentage of the people under command of professional soldiers were drafted into the service. Now war calls to arms the whole nation. And this very fact puts powerful brakes on the car of Juggernaut. "Prepare war if thou desire peace." The Latin's wisdom is discredited. The very futility of all preparations, the gruesome certainty that the breech-loaders of to-day will be useless to-morrow is one of the many curses which go with armed peace. What folly of dissipation, what waste of toil and treasure! Shall human sweat not be deemed too precious to devise and to fashion implements meant for defence and thus believed to prevent attack from without, which, ere they are finished on the anvil or formed in the furnace, are outclassed by others in this mad rage and race for more thorough preparedness for war in the interest of peace?

Our hope is founded in the advent of the plough. By a very costly and circuitous route the sword has been turned into a ploughshare even as it is now. Gun-metal had to be returned to industry, for in many cases and in an experience ever repeated, when employed for war's purpose it was, scarcely molded, detected to be insufficient, for a rival across the frontier had discovered a more powerful engine which the day after again had to be abandoned because another had hit upon a still quicker process. We would come to the plough by a more direct and less wasteful road. Yea, the plough has arrived. If it is true that every war was in the last analysis inspired by fear of hunger and not by dynastic ambition or national antipathies, then the larger the number of ploughs the less the need for war. Intensify the productive methods which coax from earth the blessings stored therein and hunger's dominion correspondingly shrinks. None need to starve if all work together to prevent famine's capricious and iniquitous intrusion.

We hail the advent of the plough. It is the sign of triumphant democracy. The toilers have always had to pay the price of war. Theirs was chiefly the toll in blood and tears and treasure, upon them the recoil inevitable of brutality. But the men of the plough have come to understand the fallacies wherewith they have hitherto been misled and duped. There is no clash between the interests of the toilers in one country and those in another. Nations are historic organisms devised to heighten the efficiency of humanity's diversified duties and achievements. Co-operation, not competition, is the ultimate solvent. With it as with the polar star, friction will be minimized. And what of friction remains can be adjusted by applying to nations the principles established in all civilized lands to the relations of individuals. If the courts are competent to maintain the social equilibrium between different contestants and litigants in one country shall we despair of international tribunals' efficiency in making for equilibrium among the nations? If all nations were united would one single nation dare reject the decree?

The plough confers moral blessings as rich as ever were those imputed to war. Does industry try men's souls less searchingly than does war? Will we lapse into hopeless materialism if we are spared the periodical crises that urge sacrifice of one for the larger good of others and many? The complexity of modern life

consecrated to the development of man and the resources of his home is such that heroism, altruism, self-sacrifice, high resolve and strenuous effort are conditions of self-maintenance. Constructive co-operation in all those things that make for the humanizing of men dispenses strength as robust and virility as elastic as ever did destructive warfare.

The vision of the prophet speaks of industrial conditions combining economic independence with social co-operation. The freedom of every individual through and in co-operation will indeed lend to the establishing of God's throne among men and above the nations. A dream this? No, a forevision. Vision is a forerunner, always, of achievement. Let nations dream of peace and peace will be sure of consummation. The hands that guide the plough carry credentials of nobility and strength less doubtful than do the fingers that pull the trigger. Not of inane impossibilities have they raved who foretold the coming of the day when nations shall no longer learn the art of war. Seated each one under his own vine and fig-tree in independence and freedom, none will covet the others' possessions, but all will bow to the decision of the Highest Judge, whose throne is pillared on Justice and whose sceptre is tipped with Righteousness.

One looking down upon us from some distant planet might easily be misled into the belief that terrestrial nations are even at this late day, twenty centuries after the birth of the child of Bethlehem, still believers in polytheism. When national hysteria seizes hold of our would-be civilized nations, the truth which one of Israel's prophets urged upon his people, the unity of God and the oneness of humanity, seems indeed to be curtained from the vision of the peoples preparing to spring at one another's throats or actually engaged in the conflict. Each of the contestants calls upon God to bless his arms, apparently oblivious of the solemn and sublime certainty that as even Mohammed knew "the East is the Lord's and the West is His also." Is there one God to watch over the soldiers of France and another to care for the regiments of Germany? War thus does not only exact heavy toll in treasure and life and limb, it also undermines the very foundations of religion's sanctuaries. It throws doubt on the essential verities of the religions that at least with their lips if not with their hearts the peoples of Christendom are professing. Should they not at least remember the obligation which the seer

of Jerusalem would have his followers rejoice in: "These with swords—yet we in the name of our God.—Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God made us all? Why then should brother deal treacherously with brother?"

The records of war often tell of swelling hymns entoned after the day of battle by victorious hosts eager to return thanks to the God who led them through the fiery furnace to the terrible hour of triumph. That such homage paid the divine arbiter lacks not impressiveness may be conceded. The battle hymn of the reformation leaping to sound from tent to tent and from camp-fire to the fireless outposts and solitary pickets, is a scene that even in description retains much of its power to move the distant or late born onlooker. Yet even so the sublimity of the act of grateful worship is eclipsed by the thought cloaked into legend in the books of old Rabbis. According to them, after the fearful day that sent Pharaoh and his army to a watery grave, the angels in heaven began singing anthems of triumph and thanksgiving. But God hushed them into awful silence, saying: "Know ye not that my children, fashioned by my hand, have been submerged in the Red Sea's wrath, and ye would sing me praises?" Yea, every battle victory is purchased by a ransom which God Himself has to pay.

His children's life is taken. To sing Him praises because victory has perched on our bayonets wears close similarity to blasphemy. If all nations have but one God, how may His worshippers pray that He be with their nation's brigades and not also with those of their adversaries?

But will not peace rob us of our manliness? Will we not sink hopelessly into the mire of materialism if never again mankind will have to pass through the hurricane that searches men's souls? Industry has magnet as strong to draw out the gold of fortitude and sacrifice from the soul of men as ever had war. Would one withhold to womanhood the tribute due heroism? And yet true women never wore the Amazon's accoutrements or rushed forth to battle. Every Madonna breathed on canvas by master genius proclaims the heroism of maternity, and in that heroism woman has saved the race for its nobler duties and sublimer destinies. The ferocity and brutalism of men often have menaced the best treasures which God has vouchsafed to the dust-born. Thousands and thousands in the battalions of peace face

death and danger almost daily as they pursue the path of their vocation. Yet of them there is neither song nor story. In the bowels of the earth the poorly compensated miner throws down the gauntlet to a mightier foe than ever met soldier on battlefield. Yet his is no glory. It is indeed not true that men and mankind will lapse into brutalism and forfeit their power to lay down life and limb in the service of ideals and duties if war shall forever be leashed. The contrary is the truth. War has always fathered brutalism. Long after the cannons have ceased to roar murder finds furious hands to do its unhuman bidding. Passions that are low are aroused by the frenzy of the contest and are kept at fever-point by the coarseness, the inhumanity of the discipline and associations of the march. Then war estranges the children of men. Long after the conclusion of peace resentments lurk behind. France still looks askance at Germany, though more than three decades have passed since their armies last measured swords on historic fields. The sword indeed estranges, the plough brings men nearer.

Last year more than one thousand French miners were suddenly entombed. The jealousy of the sprites that stand guard over the treasures left by world conflagrations in the dark caverns of the planet had once more found its opportunity to remind man that as yet his mastership was not absolute. Then from across the frontier came at early dawn a small company of German miners. They had heard of the imprisonment of their brothers and had come to risk their lives in the endeavor to bring them aid. That one act of peace has done more to remind the noble French nation of the brotherly ties that ought to bind and hold in unity all the sons of God on earth than warlike pomp and circumstance and petty nationalism and idolizing patriotism ever after will make them forget. Ah, the plough, emblem of man's peaceful dominion over nature's forces and over himself, is the sign in which nations will come to learn and read the unities and humanities always menaced by the sword. "Righteousness exalted a nation." A righteous cause may always be submitted to a righteous judge. God will decide among the nations and they shall learn war no more. Amen. Amen.

BISHOP POTTER :

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: There are two large meetings within a block or two of this hall, to one of which I have been appointed to go and speak; therefore I shall take the opportunity of saying at this moment a few words which I had hoped to say a little later. I am glad to say them now, because I am sure that I express the mind of everybody within this hall when I say to Rabbi Hirsch that he has struck the precise keynote which ought, I think, and I am sure you think, to dominate a great meeting like this. And I beg you all to believe, ladies and gentlemen, that your presence here to-night has a very high and august significance. We are not here merely for our own pleasure, we are here as representing the people of the United States of America, to say to the whole round world that we are on the side of peace, and shall use our endeavors so far as we can to make it a realization. In the family, in the school-room, in the street—wherever we can make our example or our speech understood of our fellowmen, our aim shall be in the direction of that high purpose, which is the purpose of the World's Peace Conference.

I had the pleasure,—if one can describe it in that way,—of hearing this afternoon, by an eminent Divine of my own Communion, a sermon in the interest of war. I had the pleasure of sitting under the eloquence which baptized your purpose and mine in coming here to-night as “hysterical sentimentalism.” I hope it is something more sacred and more ennobling than that!

I have been profoundly thankful to our dear brother, Rabbi Hirsch, for the line of his remarks this evening, because he had pointed out the steady growth and progress of a great people, out of such elementary ideas such as were the elementary ideas of Israel to the time of Isaiah, when the noblest prophecy that the prophet could utter was that men should beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks, and that the time should come when nations should not learn war any more. Do you realize what that word means? Have you recognized that the progress of invention, and machinery, and the ingenuity of men, married to the cleverness of mechanism, has made every war, and every instrument of war, infinitely more destructive and more menacing than it was one hundred years ago? Father Lavelle was just telling me a moment ago of an invention that either has been or is to be completed

that would destroy two hundred and fifty thousand men in fifteen minutes! Stop and reflect, ladies and gentlemen, upon the appalling picture which that presents. Try to realize that every soldier in the land,—and I am a brother of two men who served in the late Civil War, and am not likely therefore to underestimate the value of the soldier or of his service,—but remember that every soldier here, or in Russia, or in Germany, or in France, or anywhere else, represents first of all a non-producer, of whom there are more than a million in Germany;—a non-producer who must be clothed, fed and generally cared for by you and me;—that out of our pockets come the taxes, and out of our funds the resources to build a great iron cruiser that costs eight millions of dollars, or that supports the troops in any garrison in any country. God forbid that we should recklessly precipitate the abandonment either of the garrison or the armed cruiser. But, my dear sir, no achievement in the history of the Communion you represent, in South America, approaches that of those two bishops in Argentina and Chili who, when these two great peoples were expending every dollar at their command to build ships of war, and collecting men at arms, succeeded at length in having the question of the boundary line between Chili and the Argentine Republic, which was about to be fought out because of the question of the right of possession to some eighty thousand acres of land, referred to a sovereign,—the sovereign of Great Britain,—who, in turn, appointed a commission of arbitration, whose decision was accepted by both the great peoples concerned. If that can be attained, ladies and gentlemen, if the questions which have made nations, like wild beasts, fly at each other's throats for the last two hundred and fifty years, can be referred to peaceful arbitration, let us thank God for the Hague Conference!

And, let us feel a proper pride that the man who built the structure in which that conference is to meet is an American citizen, and let us by our determined hostility to every note of war hasten the triumph of universal peace! (Great applause.)

Right Rev. Monsignor M. J. Lavelle, V.G., Rector of St. Patrick's Cathedral, will now give us Archbishop Farley's message.

MONSIGNOR LAVELLE:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Archbishop Farley, although not with you to-night in body, has neither forgotten nor been lost.

(Laughter.) He was obliged to go to Washington on Wednesday last to attend the annual meeting of the archbishops of the country that is held in the National Capitol every year in the second week after Easter. He fully expected to have returned last night, but he found on Friday that his business would not be finished in time for him to reach here before Tuesday or Wednesday of this week. Consequently he sent on the address which he had prepared, and asked me as his representative vicar to come before you to-night and "rattle" in his shoes as well as I might be able to, and to present his greeting, his compliments, and his regrets for not being present, also his hearty hope and prayer that the result of this Congress in New York will have the effect of strengthening the arms and the influences of the Hague Tribunal, and bring about at the earliest possible moment the peace of the whole world. (Great applause.)

Before I begin, if one who is only a representative might be allowed a word on his own part, I would add a gloss, or an explanation to an incident that I related to Bishop Potter just before he arose to address you, and which he quoted in the course of his speech. Some four or five years ago it was narrated in one of the daily papers that a Frenchman had claimed the discovery of an implement of war,—a machine,—that would kill two hundred and fifty thousand men in fifteen minutes, and the newspaper account related that he had offered it to his own government, which refused to accept it at the price which he put upon it, but that he sold it afterward to the German Government. Eventually, I think, it has been proved that the device, if it were attempted at all, was a failure, but it might not be such a very great evil for the cause of peace if it were really a positive success, because as I can conceive it there are three ways in which the peace of the world can be brought about. One of these is by the arbitration of which the Hague Tribunal is the exponent and promoter, and through the consent of men to the decisions of a competent tribunal. That is the nearest, and as we stand at the present time, the most hopeful aspect of prospective peace that has come before the world as yet.

The second possible way is by that means to which Rabbi Hirsch alluded so eloquently, which reproduces the words of

Tennyson at the close of Locksley Hall, when he dreamed of the time:

"Till the war-drum throb'd no longer, and the battle-flags were
furl'd

In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world."

The third means might be,—and if it would come, considering human nature as it is,—it might be the surest and most permanent certainty of peace; that is, the day when war would become an absolute impossibility; when there would be no danger of people breaking away from an arbitration tribunal; no possibility of rebellion in this federation of the world, because each party would have in its hands a weapon that would make it as strong for destruction as the other. Through a mighty engine of that kind the weakest would be as strong as the strongest, and the bully and the robber-leaders of the world would be cowed before those who, though weak, were right. It is not at all impossible that this might be the real and most complete solution of the question of universal peace that could come upon this world, which has suffered so long from the dread atrocities of war.

With your kind permission I will now read to you the Archbishop's address:

Universal Peace

MOST REVEREND JOHN M. FARLEY, D.D.,

War is so great an evil that one of the world's greatest generals described it with laconic eloquence as the most perfect state of human misery. There is wanting to it no horror, moral or material.

Its benefits, if any, are indirect and uncertain; its evils are immediate, inevitable and universal—vitiation of human character, waste of life and gain, arrest of human progress, injustice to the helpless and innocent, the permanent legacies of hate, and all the fiercest and most ruinous passions of the human breast. Its genuine symbol is the storm that blots out in a brief space the harvest, the home, even life itself, leaving behind it desolation, despair, and death.

So true is this that, at all times, men have imagined perfect happiness to be some state of universal peace, a golden age long past or to dawn. "Peace on earth to men," the complement of "Glory to God on high," was the greeting which heaven sent to

earth in the most solemn hour of the world's history. Could we abolish war in the twentieth century we should hand down to posterity an earth made perfect as a dwelling place for man.

We owe a debt of gratitude, therefore, to all who devote themselves to this Christlike purpose. It is the duty of every citizen to respond to their generous appeal, and to contribute what is in him to the accomplishment of their aim. It is an aim that uplifts and ennobles all human nature, and tends to reveal in man spiritual heights and depths that get obscured in those brutal conflicts, from which he emerges always more shattered in his spiritual than in his physical life.

We must all admit that even if we cannot totally abolish war, much can be done and is being done to mitigate its horrors. The people of the world should be grateful to all who have in any way contributed, as individuals, rulers, or associations to improve the conditions of warfare, i.e., to strip it of its barbarian character, and emphasize the dignity and rights of man even on the field of battle.

I am not prepared to say that we shall ever entirely remove that dread scourge from society; but I believe it can be notably diminished in frequency and mitigated in its conduct. If this mitigation of the brutalities of war is to continue and is one day to cease among men, it will be through the influence of two great moral forces, Education and Religion.

We are told by the wise men in the daily press and in our universities that the only true and sufficient cause for war in modern times is the desire to retain areas of commercial influence, or acquire new ones, or to oust others from such as we have learned to desire. If this be the case, whatever will serve to appease the root of desire, to create a spirit of moderation and contentment, to enlarge the horizon of the heart, and show it new regions of enjoyment, certain and abiding, must prove a universal benefit. If in all the nations that make up modern Christendom the youthful generations were taught in all earnestness the law of Christian holiness and rectitude of life, and made to know the divine exemplar of that life, we should have begun the formation of a Christian Public Opinion that would in time discredit many of the motives and occasions from which wars have in the past originated.

I am of the opinion that we ought to appeal more directly to

the influence of all religious bodies. In the individual, peace is a natural fruit of the religious sentiment. Logically, therefore, it should be the mental habit of a society, that, speaking in a very broad sense, calls itself Christian, knowing no higher ideals than those of the Prince of Peace. Hence I read with pleasure that Doctor Holls, the historian of the Hague Conference, justly praises Radbertus's fine definition of the art of politics—"the royal art of ascertaining and accomplishing the will of God." Yes, "Christian justice, the maxims of the Gospel, the fear of God are the only true basis of a lasting peace." (Cardinal Rampolla in replying to the invitation of the Emperor of Russia to take part in the Hague Conference.) Public opinion we must cultivate, but any legitimate and durable public opinion must eventually have a basis of religion. Otherwise it will be only a series of popular ebullitions, a form of psychology of the mob, that to-day shouts for "Liberty" and to-morrow goes drunk over its violent extinction.

We ought to welcome all organized religious efforts in the interest of a general peace, for all such effort is essentially Christian and supremely humane and uplifting.

The real evil of our modern industrial and commercial conditions is the selfishness they tend to engender. Why should we ignore the most powerful solvent of selfishness that has ever been discovered, the religious sentiment?

I believe with all my soul that until we recognize openly the moral power and authority of religion, not of the vague individual sentiment, but of organized religion—our efforts for a universal peace will accomplish but an imperfect result.

I shall not, therefore, entirely surprise anyone if in connection with the profound influence of religion in all that tends to create and preserve a state of peace I call attention to the continuous existence of a famous tribunal of peace—the Holy See at Rome.

Its services in the past are so well known that all impartial historians, even such as do not recognize its spiritual authority, agree that for centuries it was a successful court of final resort for countless conflicts. The only practical international law for centuries was the Gospel of Christ as preached by its legatees to emperors and kings.

Through centuries of selfish feudalism, when all Europe was splintered into countless little states, the Holy See was the only

external force they bowed to and habitually invoked as unselfish, independent, courageous, beloved by the poor and weak, and feared by the rapacious and powerful.

That tribunal still exists. Lord Stanley in the House of Lords, July 25, 1887, thus referred to it, when the question of International Arbitration was under discussion: "Such a court exists already, the Court of the Bishop of Rome; all Continental Europe was disposed to recognize it as the proper arbiter when war was threatened between nations. He called attention to the happy settlement of the Caroline Islands by Leo XIII, whereby war was averted between Germany and Spain. "The Code of the Law of Nations," he continued, "drawn up at Lille by Catholic savants in November, 1886, could easily be accepted by England, which, following the example of Germany, need not hesitate to trust the impartiality of the Pope."

The Holy See is still the working head of the great Catholic body, over 256,000,000 of souls; and its moral authority was never greater. All these countless millions would surely welcome the recognition of the Holy See as a factor in International Arbitration.

It stands forth universally venerated as a divine representative committed to the works and the interests of peace by the nature and history of its office, at the head of a great working system of international religious administration which permits it to reach rapidly and efficiently the minds and the hearts of whole peoples and races.

I am not prepared to say just how the Holy See might again take its place as a factor in the work of universal peace, or how the Christian world shall resurrect a tribunal that was once its pride and honor.

It is certainly significant enough that when Czar Nicholas first proposed an International Tribunal of Peace he invited the Holy See to take part in the proceedings and that the Queen of Holland wrote personally to Leo XIII, requesting his co-operation.

I think I can safely say that if the Holy See were no longer excluded from this noble and eminently religious enterprise the thirteen or more millions of American Catholics would at once take a livelier interest in the movement for the abolition of war.

It would appear to them as more than a Utopian scheme, as something practicable, and in a large measure attainable.

I regret exceedingly that I cannot be with you to-night. I give you my best wishes, assuring you that I am present in spirit, and that my hope and prayer is that the work in New York this week may be a large factor in bringing about the approach of universal peace throughout the world.

From Stereograph. Copyright 1887, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

"GOOD-WILL AMONG MEN"

SECOND SESSION

OPENING MEETING

CARNEGIE HALL

Monday Afternoon, April Fifteenth, at 3

ANDREW CARNEGIE Presiding

MR. CARNEGIE :

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: You know it was written that, "He who governs himself is greater than he who governs a city." But, ladies and gentlemen, that was written before they knew anything about Greater New York. (Laughter.)

We have with us this afternoon the Mayor, who has kindly consented to appear and welcome our guests. A man who has governed the city well (applause), honestly, and who will retire from office possessing the confidence of all parties, and with a spotless reputation (applause). I have pleasure in presenting to you His Honor, the Mayor of Greater New York. (Applause.)

The Spirit of Nationality

HON. GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN

I am exceedingly gratified to have this opportunity of meeting so many of you who have done, and are doing and will continue to do, so much for the purpose which you have met to further.

This assemblage, presided over by one of the foremost citizens of the United States, under his inspiration, is not striving for the impossible, but seeking by practical methods to serve the cause of international peace with honor.

That a movement for universal peace is considered seriously, that many practical men believe that it may, in God's good time and in God's own way, come to fruition, is because of a new spirit that influences mankind.

The dream of peace is no new thing. It was dreamed two centuries ago, and the dreamers awoke to the stern reality of the doctrine of the balance of power, which was but magniloquence for land-lust, and the glorification of highway robbery. A century later Castlereagh dreamed of disarmament, and awoke to join

the concert of Europe, which, ignoring natural boundaries, race, religion and nationality, existed for the maintenance of the *status quo*, which had been reached by the strict application of the doctrine, "to the victor belongs the spoils."

The century which was born amid the loud acclaim of the universal brotherhood of man, died with Europe one vast, armed camp. And yet the century which saw at its beginning Marengo and Austerlitz, saw at its close the meeting of the first Hague Conference.

The tattered soldiers of the French Revolution sowed a seed which under the great Napoleon took root and grew, and bore a flower, the spirit of nationality, which has revolutionized the world, enduring all things, doing all things, daring all things.

The nation is after all nothing more than a vast aggregation of individuals held together by a community of interests, with all the breadth and the limitations, with all the strength and the weaknesses, with all the virtues and the vices of its component parts.

Without community of interests States may flourish personified by their sovereigns, and held together by force of arms, but the spirit of nationality can exist only where purposes, ambitions and aspirations are shared by all. And because of this spirit the nations themselves, and not the sovereigns, are the dominant factors in world politics. In these days of triumphant democracy sovereignty is in the people, and it is their will which sways the world.

I am one of those who believe that the world was better yesterday than it was the day before; is better to-day than it was yesterday, and with God's blessing, will be better to-morrow than it is to-day. Mortal man is by instinct a fighting animal. Were he not so he would never have survived in the fierce struggle for existence, and would never have reached his present state of civilization. But fighting animal though he is, he realizes the advantages of peace, and as the world grows better he becomes more willing to hesitate before sacrificing peace for war. You can no more secure universal peace by resolution than you can make mankind perfect by act of Congress.

With the individual sinner a declaration of reform is often conclusive evidence of a sincere change of heart, but with the chanceries of the world, works meet for repentance must be

brought forth before they can be believed. It is not so much a matter of world importance what those taking part in international conferences agree to do or not to do, as it is whether or not after adjournment they really try to keep the peace.

There is no government on earth that is not influenced more or less by public opinion. If governments are to be made to appreciate thoroughly the advantages of peace, then the peoples of the earth must be taught to appreciate its blessings. If the nations sincerely desire peace, there is scarcely a difference that can arise among them that cannot be adjusted by peaceful arbitration.

Your duty, as that of every one who knows the difference between national honor and national land-lust, between true courage and swash-buckling, is to convince the world that man has a higher, nobler mission than to be forever at his brother's throat; that war should be resorted to only as a last desperate remedy for injustice and oppression. The task which you have set yourselves, and which can be accomplished, is to cultivate a spirit of sober common sense among men, a sense which will cause them to think twice before going to extremes, and to hesitate before glorifying the war spirit. To such a public opinion governments must bow. Putting into practice their high-sounding professions of mutual good-will they must, with due regard for each other's interests, live in harmony one with another.

The people of this city have always been among the first to take up arms in defence of the flag, when it has been in danger. But they believe that our country can best be served by a national policy so just and so righteous that the flag will never be assailed. They believe that justice and righteousness require a spirit of tolerance, of respect and of amity among the nations, a spirit which will not only insure the peace of the world but will permit man in his evolution to move always onward and upward.

The people of New York believe that this Congress is a part of a great world movement toward a better international understanding, and that its influence must be felt for good. Through me, their Mayor, they wish you God-speed upon your mission, and bid you welcome to their city.

Letter from President Roosevelt

Read by the Secretary of the Congress, ROBERT ERSKINE ELY.

I much regret my inability to be present with you. Mr. Root will speak to you at length, and no man in the country is better fitted than he to address you on the subject you have so much at heart; for no man has in keener or more practical fashion, or with a nobler disinterestedness of purpose, used the national power to further what I believe to be the national purpose of bringing nearer the day when the peace of righteousness, the peace of justice, shall obtain among nations.

In this letter of mine, I can do little more than wish you and your association God-speed in your efforts. My sympathy with the purpose you have at heart is both strong and real, and by right of it I shall make to you some suggestions as to the practical method for accomplishing the ends we all of us have in view. First and foremost, I beseech you to remember that tho it is our bounden duty to work for peace, yet it is even more our duty to work for righteousness and justice. It is "Righteousness that exalteth a nation," and tho normally peace is the handmaid of righteousness, yet, if they are ever at odds, it is righteousness whose cause we must espouse. In the second place, I again earnestly ask that all good and earnest men who believe strongly in this cause, but who have not themselves to bear the responsibility of upholding the nation's honor, shall not by insisting upon the impossible, put off the day when the possible can be accomplished. The peoples of the world have advanced unequally along the road that leads to justice and fair-dealing, one with another (exactly as there has been unequal progress in securing such justice by each within its own borders); and the road stretches far ahead even of the most advanced. Harm and not good would result if the most advanced nations, those in which most freedom for the individual is combined with most efficiency in securing orderly justice as between individuals, should by agreement disarm and place themselves at the mercy of other peoples less advanced, of other peoples still in the stage of military barbarism or military despotism. Anything in the nature of general disarmament would do harm and not good if it left the civilized and peace-loving peoples, those with the highest standards of muni-

cial and international obligation and duty, unable to check the other peoples who have no such standards, who acknowledge no such obligations.

Finally, it behooves all of us to remember, and especially those of us who either make or listen to speeches, that there are few more mischievous things than the custom of uttering or applauding sentiments which represent mere oratory, and which are not, and cannot be, and have not been, translated from words into deeds. An impassioned oration about peace which includes an impassioned demand for something which the man who makes the demand either knows or ought to know, cannot, as a matter of fact, be done, represents not gain, but loss, for the cause of peace; for even the noblest cause is marred by advocacy which is either insincere or foolish.

These warnings that I have uttered do not mean that I believe we can do nothing to advance the cause of international peace. On the contrary, I believe that we can do much to advance it, provided only we act with sanity, with self-restraint, with power; which must be the prime qualities in the achievement of any reform. The nineteenth century saw, on the whole, a real and great advance in the standard of international conduct, but as among civilized nations and by strong nations toward weaker and more backward peoples, the twentieth century will, I believe, witness a much greater advance in the same direction. The United States has a right to speak on behalf of such a cause, and to ask that its course during the half dozen opening years of the century be accepted as a guaranty of the truth of its professions.

During these six years we can conscientiously say that without sacrificing our own rights, we have yet scrupulously respected the rights of all other peoples. With the great military nations of the world, alike in Europe and in that newest Asia, which is also the oldest, we have preserved a mutually self-respecting and kindly friendship. In the Philippine Islands we are training a people in the difficult art of self-government, with more success than those best acquainted with the facts had dared to hope. We are doing this because we have acted in a spirit of genuine disinterestedness—of genuine and single-minded purpose to benefit the islanders—and, I may add, in a spirit

wholly untainted by that silly sentimentality which is often more dangerous to both the subject and the object than downright iniquity.

In Panama we are successfully performing what is to be the greatest engineering feat of the ages, and while we are assuming the whole burden of the work, we have explicitly pledged ourselves that the use is to be free for all mankind. In the islands of the Caribbean we have interfered not as conquerors, but solely to avert the need of conquest. The United States Army is at this moment in Cuba, not as an act of war, but to restore Cuba to the position of a self-governing republic. With Santo Domingo, we have just negotiated a treaty especially designed to prevent the need of any interference either by us or by any foreign nation with the internal affairs of the island, while at the same time securing to honest creditors their debts and to the government of the islands an assured income, and giving to the islanders themselves the chance, if only they will take advantage of it, to achieve the internal peace they so sorely need.

Mr. Root's trip thru South America marked the knitting together in the bonds of self-respecting friendship of all the republics of this continent; it marked a step toward the creation among them of a community of public feeling which will tell for justice and peace thruout the western hemisphere. By the joint good offices of Mexico and ourselves, we averted one war in Central America, and did what we could to avert another, altho we failed. We have more than once, while avoiding officious international meddling, shown our readiness to help other nations secure peace among themselves. A difficulty which we had with our friendly neighbor to the south of us, we solved by referring it to arbitration at The Hague. A difficulty which we had with our friendly neighbor to the north of us, we solved by the agreement of a joint commission composed of representatives of the two peoples in interest. We try to avoid meddling in affairs that are not our concern, and yet to have our views heard where they will avail on behalf of fair-dealing and against cruelty and oppression. We have concluded certain arbitration treaties. I only regret that we have not concluded a larger number.

Our representatives will go to the Second Peace Conference at The Hague instructed to help in every practicable way to bring some steps nearer completion the great work which the First Con-

ference began. It is idle to expect that a task so tremendous can be settled by one or two conferences, and those who demand the impossible from such a Conference not only prepare acute disappointment for themselves, but by arousing exaggerated and baseless hopes which are certain to be disappointed, play the game of the very men who wish the Conference to accomplish nothing. It is not possible that the Conference should go more than a certain distance further in the right direction. Yet I believe that it can make real progress on the road toward international justice, peace and fair-dealing. One of the questions, although not to my mind one of the most important, which will be brought before the conference, will be that of the limitation of armaments. The United States, owing to its peculiar position, has a regular army so small as to be infinitesimal when compared to that of any other first-class power. But the circumstances which enable this to be so are peculiar to our case, and do not warrant us in assuming the offensive attitude of schoolmaster toward other nations. We are no longer enlarging our navy. We are simply keeping up its strength, very moderate indeed when compared with our wealth, population and coast-line; for the addition of one battleship a year barely enables us to make good the units which become obsolete. The most practical step in diminishing the burden of expense caused by the increasing size of naval armament would, I believe, be an agreement limiting the size of all ships hereafter to be built; but hitherto it has not proved possible to get other nations to agree with us on this point.

More important than reducing the expense of the implements of war is the question of reducing the possible causes of war, which can most effectually be done by substituting other methods than war for the settlement of disputes. Of those other methods, the most important which is now attainable is arbitration. I do not believe that in the world as it actually is, it is possible for any nation to agree to arbitrate all difficulties which may arise between itself and other nations; but I do believe that there can be at this time a very large increase in the classes of cases which it is agreed shall be arbitrated, and that provision can be made for greater facility and certainty of arbitration. I hope to see adopted a general arbitration treaty among the nations; and I hope to see the Hague Court greatly increased in power and

permanency, and the judges in particular made permanent and given adequate salaries, so as to make it increasingly probable that in each case that may come before them, they will decide between the nations, great or small, exactly as a judge within our own limits decides between the individuals, great or small, who come before him. Doubtless many other matters will be taken up at The Hague; but it seems to me that this of a general arbitration treaty is perhaps the most important.

Again wishing you all good fortune in your work,

Sincerely yours,

Theodore Roosevelt

MR. CARNEGIE:

You all know every President must have some man who is his right hand. Sometimes they get a man who is more than a right hand, and does for him some of the head work as well. We are now to hear from a gentleman who has traveled further North and further South than any other Secretary of State we were ever blessed with, carrying the olive branch of Peace and Brotherhood to the furthest Republic in the South, and up to Canada in the North. He has made, he is going to make, a great, great record. (Applause.)

Among many other good qualities he has, he is a New Yorker. I beg leave to present to you Honorable Elihu Root, Secretary of State.

The American Sentiment of Humanity

HON. ELIHU ROOT

In every country which has reached a high stage of civilization may be seen the working of two distinct and apparently inconsistent motives or principles in national conduct. On the one hand, there is the narrowly and immediately utilitarian motive, and there is the competitive attitude fashioned upon the habits of self-preservation and self-assertion enjoined by the necessities of the struggle for existence. With this motive each country pursues specific national advantages, meeting in a hard, dry, business-like way, without sympathy or sentiment, the facts of a

world in which there is much selfishness and greed, in which every nation is primarily looking out for itself, and in which there is ordinarily some aggressor ready to take advantage of the over-trusting and defenceless.

On the other hand, there is the ethical, altruistic, human impulse that presses forward constantly toward ideals. Its possessors, loving liberty and justice and peace, long to make all men free and safe and secure in their rights; their eyes are fixed upon the ultimate good toward which civilization tends; they are striving that better things shall replace the cynicism and selfishness and cruelty which have always so widely characterized mankind; they assert principles and set up standards of action, which they call upon mankind to adopt; and mankind too often gives theoretical assent but denies practical conformity. In every man's nature there are manifestations or traces of each of these impulses; in every nation there are many citizens in whom one, and many in whom the other impulse strongly predominates. As circumstances bring one class of motives or another into control of national conduct in different fields of national action, strangely variant and inconsistent national action results. The same nation may be seen at one time hard and practical, at another or perhaps in another field at the same time, exhibiting the highest degree of unselfishness and humanity. Under the predominance of one motive national power has been built up; administration has been made effective; commerce has been extended; material wealth, the matrix of civilization, has been created and protected; the citizens of each country have been secured against aggression from without; and, in the slow process of centuries, the code of practical rules convenient and necessary to the peaceable intercourse of nations has been elaborated. Under the predominance of the other motive, the conception of individual charity and humanity, which found its highest expression in the Christian Revelation, has slowly impressed itself upon the conception of national duty and responsibility. In its development the idea of national conscience and national ethics has been forced into the international system which formerly acknowledged the undisputed sway of selfishness and cruelty, long condemned as immoral in the relations between individuals.

It is natural that the hard and practical motive shall be uppermost in the men engaged in the conduct of government; they are

endowed with limited and definite powers and charged with specific trusts for the benefit of their own people; their duties are to protect and advance the interests of their own country, and those duties relate, in the main, to the material interests of their countrymen; their specific powers are given to them for that specific purpose; they have no warrant of attorney to express or give effect to the benevolent or humanitarian impulses of their constituents; under constitutional government, as a rule, such expression is not conferred by law upon public officers, but is reserved to the people. In the discharge of their international duties governmental officers have to deal with a world of selfish competition and ever-present possibility of aggression and inquiry, which compel them to think first and chiefly of the interest of their own country as a lawyer argues the case of his client. They are constrained by the rules of conduct between nations which the experience of centuries has shown to be necessary to the peace of the world. Among the first of these is, that the government of each nation shall attend to its own business, and respect the sovereignty and refrain from interfering with the internal affairs of every other nation. This rule is the chief protection of the liberty of small and weak nations against the aggression of the strong. To break it down whenever the officers of one government disapprove the conduct of another government within its own jurisdiction, would be to break down the barriers which civilization has erected for the protection of the weak, with results as fatal as if the executive were allowed to make orders and the judge to issue decrees according to their own kindly impulses without regard to the limitations of law.

It is natural that the altruistic and humanitarian view, broader and less immediately practical, shall be taken by students and thinkers, by teachers and philosophers, by men who, not burdened by the necessity of putting theories into practice, are at liberty to look upon the world as it ought to be and to urge mankind on toward acceptance of their ideals. These men are masters of their own power; they have a warrant from all whom their eloquence, their persuasion, their reasoning, or the inherent soundness of their ideas bring into agreement with them, to press their views upon the world and insist upon conformity. In every civilized land their numbers, their power and their following have increased, most of all in lands where

freedom is most perfect and justice most pure, until the voices of the few visionaries, long ago crying in the wilderness, have become the sound of a multitude; and a public opinion of the world, insisting upon righteousness and peace among nations as among individuals, is beginning to be perceived and to effect the national purpose which governments represent.

It is inevitable that the men who are directed by these two widely differing impulses should sometimes be impatient of each other. The humanitarian is repelled by the hardness of the practical man, who seems unsympathetic in his failure to act upon views that are certainly sound in the abstract and which ought to be accepted by all the world. The practical administrator is distressed by the urgency of the theorist, who, ignorant of real conditions, urges him to a course of action which he knows cannot possibly be taken, or, if it were taken under existing conditions, would result only in evil. One tends to think lightly of the other as an impracticable theorist, and in return is condemned by the other as unfeeling and cynical. Both judgments are probably often, to some extent, true, but both are generally, and to a much greater extent, wrong. Each class plays its necessary part in the great work of advancing civilization. It cannot be doubted that the supreme results for humanity are secured by the combination, the union, the blending of the two impulses, to the end that national selfishness may be the most broadly intelligent, and humanitarian idealism the most effectively practical.

Your invitation to take part in the opening of this Peace Congress has come to me as an occasion to declare the alliance and sympathy of the American Government with that other power—the sentiment of humanity—which in all lands, and most strongly in our generation, without fleets, or armies, or titles, or dignities, or compulsion of force, is leading mankind continually to a nobler life. The American people are practical, material, strenuous in business, eager for wealth; energetic in production, and venturesome in commerce; insistent upon their rights, proud of their country, jealous of its power and its prestige; but there is a stream of idealism in the American nature which saves our nation from the grossness of sordid materialism and makes it responsive to every appeal in behalf of liberty and righteousness, of peace with justice and of human

brotherhood the world over. No American Government could truly represent its people if it did not sympathize heartily with the purposes which this Congress meets to promote; and the American Government of to-day does sympathize heartily with those purposes. In behalf of the Government I give you the kindly and appreciative greeting of the people of the United States and welcome you as spiritual kindred of those Americans of great heart and clear intelligence who in times past, striving for ordered liberty and the peace of justice in this land, have conferred inestimable benefits upon all mankind, and whose memory and example are our most precious possessions.

He is mistaken who depreciates the value of such a meeting as this, or regards its discussions as merely academic, because its members have not the power themselves to give effect to their resolutions. The open, public declaration of a principle in such a way as to carry evidence that it has the support of a great body of men entitled to respect, has a wonderfully compelling effect upon mankind. The adoption of a new standard of human action is never the result of force or the threat of force; it is always the result of a moral process, and to the initiation and continuance of that process public assertion and advocacy of the principle are essential. When that process has been worked out and the multitude of men whom governments represent have reached the point of genuine and not perfunctory acceptance of the new standard, governments conform themselves to it.

It is a common saying that the world is ruled by force, that the ultimate sanction for the rules of right conduct between nations is the possibility of war. That is less than a half-truth. There was a time when the official intercourse between nations which we call diplomacy consisted chiefly of bargaining and largely of cheating in the bargain. Diplomacy now consists chiefly in making national conduct conform or appear to conform to the rules, which codify, embody and apply certain moral standards evolved and accepted in the slow development of civilization. The continual unceasing process of diplomatic intercourse by which these standards are pressed upon the government of every nation, backed by the tremendous power of the opinions of the civilized world, enforced by the desire for the good opinion and apprehension of the disfavor of mankind, form a strong

external restraint upon national conduct; and these standards have been created by the evolution of moral as opposed to physical forces.

The value of declaring a principle may be illustrated by the effect of the arbitration convention agreed upon in the International Peace Conference at The Hague in 1899. That Convention did a little more than to declare principles; it provided machinery by which there might be arbitration, but it bound nobody to arbitrate, or to mediate, or to accept mediation. The machinery provided has been but little used; the arbitrations at The Hague have been few and not of the first order of importance; yet no one can for a moment question the enormous impetus given to the principles of arbitration of international controversies in lieu of war by the open and public declaration that such controversies ought to be arbitrated.

The thoughts of all men who hope for the peace of the world are now turned toward the Second Peace Conference so soon to meet at The Hague. It is cheering to note the difference between the attitude of the world toward this conference about to meet and the way in which the world looked upon the First Conference at The Hague eight years ago. The generous impulse and noble sentiment of the Emperor of Russia which dictated the call for that Conference, supported by his great power and commanding position, compelled the respect or the appearance of respect from all the great powers; yet it is safe to say that the prevailing sentiment among the powers as to the practical value of the Conference was one of polite incredulity, and that the delegates whom he had called together met amid an almost universal belief that nothing would or could be accomplished. The primary object of the call for the First Conference—the accomplishment of the great design which Henry IV of France conceived three centuries ago for the limitation of armaments in Europe—failed for the time; yet the Conference accomplished other things of the highest value to humanity; and it demonstrated for the first time in the world's history the potent and epoch-making fact, that a Congress of the world's powers, convened not to deal with some concrete question demanding immediate solution, but convened to consider and discuss the application of the general and fundamental principles of justice and humanity under all circumstances and to all international questions, can be made a

practical and effective agency in the government of the world. It developed a new method and a new power for the betterment of international conduct, far superior to the ordinary rules of diplomatic intercourse, far broader in its scope, far nobler in its purpose.

Upon the eve of the Second Conference, whose very possibility demonstrates the success and approves the wisdom of the First, it seems to me that all men who love their fellowmen and who hope for the rule of righteousness and peace on earth, should feel a deep sentiment of gratitude toward that sovereign whose noble character led him to call together the First Conference and an equally deep sympathy with him in the hard and difficult task in which he is now engaged of establishing constitutional government in his own dominions.

The Second Conference is about to meet amid universal recognition that it is of practical significance; it commands respect; its possibilities are the object of solicitude; the resolutions which it may reach are anticipated as of probable potency in the affairs of nations; it is not regarded as an occasion for mere academic discussion, but finds its place among the agencies by which the world is governed. I cannot doubt that it will accomplish much for the benefit of mankind; that in many things it will bring the practice of nations into closer conformity with these great principles of conduct to which nations have accorded such ready assent in theory, but such reluctant compliance when their particular interests are involved. The First Conference relegated to a future Conference the consideration of three broad general questions affecting the conduct of nations toward each other: First, the rights and duties of neutrals; second, the inviolability of private property in naval warfare; and third, the bombardment of towns, villages and ports by a naval force. It is understood that all these subjects shall be considered at the Second Conference. The First Conference also adopted two resolutions relating to naval and military armament.

The first was:

"The Conference is of opinion that the restriction of military charges, which are at present a heavy burden on the world, is extremely desirable for the increase of the material and moral welfare of mankind."

The second was :

"The Conference expresses the wish that the governments, taking into consideration the proposals made at the Conference, may examine the possibility of an agreement as to the limitation of armed forces by land and sea and of war budgets."

The Government of the United States has been of the opinion that the subject matter of these resolutions ought to be further considered and discussed in the Second Conference; that the subject is in the nature of unfinished business and cannot be ignored, but must be dealt with; that there ought to be at least an earnest effort to reach or to make progress toward reaching some agreement under which the enormous expenditure of money and the enormous withdrawal of men from productive industry for warlike purposes may be reduced or arrested or retarded. We have not been unmindful of the fact that the question is one which primarily and in its present stage concerns Europe rather than America; that the conditions which have led to the great armaments of the present day are mainly European conditions, and that it would ill become us to be forward or dogmatic in a matter which is so much more vital to the nations of Europe than to ourselves. It sometimes happens, however, that a State having little or no special material interest in a proposal can, for that very reason, advance the proposal with the more advantage and the less prejudice. The American Government accordingly, at an early stage of the discussion regarding the program, reserved the right to present this subject for the consideration of the Conference; several European powers have also given notice of their intention to present the subject. It may be that the discussion will not bring the Second Conference to any definite and practical conclusion; certainly no such conclusion can be effective unless it meet with practically universal assent, for there can be no effective agreement which binds some of the great powers and leaves others free. There are serious difficulties in formulating any definite proposal which would not be objectionable to some of the powers, and upon the question whether any specific proposal is unfair and injurious to its interests each power must be, and is entitled to be, its own judge.

Nevertheless, the effort can be made; it may fail in this Conference, as it failed in the First; but if it fails, one more step will

have been taken toward ultimate success. Long-continued and persistent effort is always necessary to bring mankind into conformity with great ideals; every great advance that civilization has made on its road from savagery has been upon stepping-stones of failure, and a good fight bravely lost for a sound principle is always a victory.

The Government of the United States has also considered that the Second Hague Conference might well agree in putting some limitation upon the use of force for the collection of ordinary contract debts due by one government to the citizens of another.

It has long been the established policy of the United States not to use its army and navy for the collection of such debts. We have not considered the use of force for such a purpose consistent with that respect for the independent sovereignty of other members of the family of nations which is the most important principle of international law and the chief protection of weak nations against oppression. It seems to us that the practice is injurious in its general effect upon the relations of nations and upon the welfare of weak and disordered States, whose development ought to be encouraged in the interests of civilization, and that it offers frequent temptation to bullying and oppression and to unnecessary and unjustifiable warfare. It is possible that the non-payment of public debts may be accomplished by such circumstances of fraud and wrong-doing or violation of treaties as to justify the use of force as a last resort; but we hope to see an international consideration of the subject which shall discriminate between such causes and the simple non-performance of a contract with a private person, and to see a resolution in favor of reliance exclusively upon peaceful means, in cases of the latter class. It may well be that the principle of arbitration can be so extended in its application that the class of adventurers who have long been in the habit of trading upon the necessities of weak and distressed governments may be required to submit their often exorbitant and unconscionable demands to an impartial tribunal before which both parties can hear both as to the validity and the amount of their claims and the time and manner of payment to which they are entitled. The record of the cases submitted to arbitration during recent years shows that the total awards of the arbitral tribunals have amounted to a very small percentage of the demands submitted. It is difficult to resist the inference that the

claims of private citizens who seek the good offices of their own government to obtain payment from other countries generally need investigation by fair tribunals rather than immediate and peremptory enforcement.

In the general field of arbitration we are surely justified in hoping for a substantial advance both as to scope and effectiveness. It has seemed to me that the great obstacles to the universal adoption of arbitration is not the unwillingness of civilized nations to submit their demands to the decision of an impartial tribunal; it is rather an apprehension that the tribunal selected will not be impartial. In a despatch to Sir Julian Pauncefote dated March 5, 1896, Lord Salisbury stated this difficulty. He said that:

"If the matter in controversy is important, so that defeat is a serious blow to the credit or the power of the litigant who is worsted, that interest becomes a more or less keen partisanship. According to their sympathies, men wish for the victory of one side or another. Such conflicting sympathies interfere most formidably with the choice of an impartial arbitrator. It would be too invidious to specify the various forms of bias by which, in any important controversy between two great powers, the other members of the commonwealth of nations are visibly affected. In the existing condition of international sentiment, each great power could point to nations whose admission to any jury by whom its interests were to be tried, it would be found to challenge; and in a litigation between two great powers the rival challenges would pretty well exhaust the catalogue of the nations from which competent and suitable arbiters could be drawn. It would be easy, but scarcely decorous, to illustrate this statement by examples. They will occur to anyone's mind who attempts to construct a panel of nations capable of providing competent arbitrators, and will consider how many of them would command equal confidence from any two litigating powers.

"This is the difficulty which stands in the way of unrestricted arbitration. By whatever plan the tribunal is selected, the end of it must be that issues in which the litigant States are most deeply interested will be decid

by the vote of one man, and that man a foreigner. He has no jury to find his facts; he has no court to appeal to to correct his law; and he is sure to be credited, justly or not, with a leaning to one litigant or the other."

The feeling which Lord Salisbury so well expressed is, I think, the great stumbling-block in the way of arbitration. The essential fact which supports that feeling is, that arbitrators too often act diplomatically rather than judicially; they consider themselves as belonging to diplomacy rather than to jurisprudence; they measure their responsibility and their duty by the traditions, the sentiments and the sense of honorable obligation which have grown up in centuries of diplomatic intercourse, rather than by the traditions, the sentiments and the sense of honorable obligation which characterize the judicial departments of civilized nations. Instead of the sense of responsibility for impartial judgment which weighs upon the judicial officers of every civilized country, and which is enforced by the honor and self-respect of every upright judge, an international arbitration is often regarded as an occasion for diplomatic adjustment. Granting that the diplomats who are engaged in an arbitration have the purest motives; that they act in accordance with the policy they deem to be best for the nations concerned in the controversy; assuming that they thrust aside entirely in their consideration any interests which their own countries may have in the controversy or in securing the favor or averting the displeasure of the parties before them; nevertheless it remains that in such an arbitration the litigant nations find that questions of policy and not simple questions of fact and law are submitted to alien determination, and an appreciable part of that sovereignty which it is the function of every nation to exercise for itself in determining its own policy, is transferred to the arbitrators.

An illustration of this view is to be found in the fact that one of the features of the extraordinary advance made by the nations of South America in the arts of peace is the development of arbitration for the settlement of disputes, and especially boundary disputes, to a greater degree than in any other part of the world. This has been facilitated by the almost complete detachment of South American politics from the international politics of Europe; so that it has been easy for the South American States to find arbitrators who neither knew nor cared for any political

question in South America, and who, therefore, have been able to determine the questions before them with sole reference to the merits of the question, as a trained and upright judge decides a case submitted to his court.

What we need for the further development of arbitration is the substitution of judicial action for diplomatic action, the substitution of judicial sense of responsibility for diplomatic sense of responsibility. We need for arbitration, not distinguished public men concerned in all the international questions of the day, but judges who will be interested only in the question appearing upon the record before them. Plainly this end is to be attained by the establishment of a court of permanent judges who will have no other occupation and no other interest but the exercise of the judicial faculty under the sanction of that high sense of responsibility which has made the courts of justice in the civilized nations of the world the exponents of all that is best and noblest in modern civilization.

Let me add a few words of warning concerning your anticipations of what the Second Peace Conference is to do. Do not expect too much of it.

It is an essential characteristic of such a Conference that it shall deal not with matters upon which the nations differ, but with matters upon which the nations agree. Immaterial differences may be smoothed away; misunderstandings may be explained; consideration and discussion along lines that do not run counter to any immediate and specific interest may work out methods of applying general principles in such a way as to prevent future differences; progress may be made toward agreement upon matters which are not yet ripe for complete adjustment; but the moment an attempt is made to give such a Conference any coercive effect, the moment any number of nations endeavor to use the Conference for the purpose of compelling any other nation to do what it deems inconsistent with its interests, that moment the Conference fails.

Such a Conference is an agency of peace; not the peace of conquest, but the peace of agreement; not enforced agreement, but willing and cheerful agreement. So far as the nations can go together in such an agreement, the Conference can go, and no further.

Many lovers of their kind, certain that the principles which

they see so clearly ought to be accepted of all men, are unmindful of the many differences which divide the nations in the competition of trade and wealth, for honor and prestige; unmindful that the selfishness and greed and willingness to do injustice which have marked all human history still exist in the world; unmindful that because of these, the instinct of self-protection engenders distrust and suspicion among the nations; and they will be sadly disappointed because the Hague Conference of 1907 does not realize their dreams and usher in "the parliament of man the federation of the world." But let them take heart: a forward step will be taken; an advance will be made toward the reign of peace and justice and righteousness among men, and that advance will go just as far as the character of the great mass of civilized men permits. There lies the true measure of possibility and the true origin of reforming force. Arbitration and mediation, treaties and conventions, peace resolutions, declarations of principle, speeches and writings, are as naught unless they truly represent and find a response in the hearts and minds of the multitude of the men who make up the nations of the earth, whose desires and impulses determine the issue of peace and war.

The end toward which this assemblage strives—the peace of the world—will be attained just as rapidly as the millions of the earth's peoples learn to love peace and abhor war; to love justice and hate wrong-doing; to be considerate in their judgment and kindly in feeling toward aliens as toward their own friends and neighbors; and to desire that their own countries shall regard the rights of others rather than be grasping and overreaching. The path to universal peace is not through reason or intellectual appreciation, but through the development of peace-loving and peace-keeping character among men; and that this development, slow though it be as measured by our short lives, is proceeding with steady and unrelenting advance from generation to generation no student of history can question. The greatest benefit of the Peace Conference of 1907 will be, as was that of the Peace Conference of 1899, in the fact of the Conference itself; in its powerful influence molding the characters of men; in the spectacle of all the great powers of the earth meeting in the name of peace, and exalting as worthy of honor and desire, national self-control, considerate judgment and willingness to do justice.

From Stereograph. Copyright 1907. by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

GOV. CHARLES E. HUGHES

HON. SETH LOW

HON. ELIHU ROOT

HON. OSCAR S. STRAUS

HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT

MR. CARNEGIE:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: There are two classes of politicians, those who seek the office, and those whom the office seeks. (Applause.)

There are at least two instances in our history of men in private life who pursued the path of duty—professional duty—thinking of nothing else but doing their duty. The beautiful lines of the poet are applicable to them. Tennyson says of the Duke of Wellington, following the path of duty:

“The path of duty was the way to glory;
He that walks it only thirsting
For the right, and learns to deaden
Love of self, before his journey closes
He shall find the stubborn thistle bursting
Into glossy purples, which out-redden
All voluptuous garden roses.”

So it is with the gentleman I am about to present to you. He has begun his public career. Every man and woman in the State of New York, and in the United States, for that matter, knows that here is a man whose aims end not with self; that he embraces the office, with all its trials, disappointments, troubles, not because he sought it, but because the call of duty came to him.

I am delighted to present to you our Governor Hughes.

(Mr. Hughes was greeted with such vociferous applause that Mr. Carnegie arose and cried “Have mercy on the Governor!”)

Welcome from New York

GOVERNOR CHARLES E. HUGHES

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It is not my function to deliver a formal address upon any of the topics which will engage your attention, but rather in the name of the State of New York to bid you a hearty welcome. It is my pleasant duty to express the gratification of our citizens at the meeting of this Congress and their appreciation of the important influences which must radiate from such a representative assemblage.

It is fitting that this meeting should be held in a State representing in so conspicuous a degree the varied activities of peace, and in a metropolis which focuses the energies of a people who,

in beneficent concord, without desire of conquest or lust of power, are working out their destiny inspired by national ideals of equality and justice. (Applause.)

As a New Yorker, and as one representing the State in an official capacity, I find it agreeable to recall the names of its distinguished sons who have contributed in a marked manner to achievements in the interest of the peace of the world. You will not think it amiss if I claim for this role of honor the foremost citizen of the nation, whose federal activities have not obscured his relationship to his native State and the lustre of whose fame as President of the Republic has been heightened by his service as pacificator. (Applause.)

New York has also given to the nation the eminent public servant who has addressed you, the keeper of our foreign interests in whose wise diplomacy every citizen is assured of the astute and jealous defense of our peaceful policies. We may also claim by right of his adoption the presiding genius of this Congress (applause), whose personal interest and generous benefactions have contributed so notably to the progress of this world-movement.

When the first Peace Conference met at The Hague three of the six representatives of the United States were New Yorkers—Andrew D. White, the scholar and veteran diplomatist; that eminent citizen of this metropolis, Seth Low; and the lamented Frederick William Holls, the versatile secretary of the American Commission and the historian of the work of the Conference. (Applause.) New York also should take special pride in the intelligent service in the cause of international arbitration which long in advance of the meeting of that Conference was rendered by the lawyers of this State.

In January, 1896, following an address delivered before it by the Hon. Chauncey M. Depew, the New York State Bar Association appointed a committee to consider the subject of international arbitration, and to devise and submit to it a plan for the organization of a tribunal to which international questions might be submitted. In April of the same year, after careful deliberation, the committee made its report, recommending the establishment of an International Court of Arbitration, to be composed of members selected by the agreeing nations and to be open at all times for the submission of controversies. The plan was laid

before the President of the United States, and later, as Secretary Foster states in his recent work, it became the basis of the instructions of the American delegates to the Hague Conference, and in accordance with this plan are found to be the essential features of the Permanent Court now in existence at The Hague. (Applause.) It is gratifying to trace this preliminary and influential activity of our public-spirited fellow citizens, and we of the State of New York welcome the members of this Congress with a cordiality emphasized by our long and sincere interest in the questions you are to consider.

There are few, if any, to plead the cause of war in general, however it may be defended in particular. Statesmen and soldiers alike condemn it, and against its monstrous cruelties and wastefulness, commerce and sentiment are allied. The necessity of war as a last defence of liberty and honor is admitted only to be deprecated, and in the desire to prevent armed strife, there is almost complete unanimity. There may still be those who believe in the beneficent effects of the discipline of war, and who shrink from contemplating a society enervated by exclusive devotion to the pursuits of peace. Undoubtedly benefits have been conferred by war. Against the dark background of ruin, desolation and death, the elemental virtues of humanity have stood out in bold relief. And aside from the important and beneficial results of certain wars, the world has largely learned its lessons of courage and fortitude, of the supremacy of duty and the sacred obligations of honor from those who, in fierce but heroic struggle, have revealed the noblest qualities of humanity. "He maketh the wrath of man to praise Him."

But while we justly appraise these consequences of past conflicts, we also know well their cost, and we keenly appreciate the frightful evils and the enormous wastes which have been incident to the evolution of the race through strife. We rejoice that the currents of progress lead to peace and that the time is sure to come when war will be unthinkable.

We can no longer look to war for the development of either national or individual character. The heroics of war have been replaced by mathematical calculations. (Applause.) If it was ever anything else, it is now unmitigated horror, exhibiting chiefly fiendish aspects of ingenuity and scientific skill in destruction. Under our modern conditions of civilization the supposed benefi-

cent results of war in the development of courage and stamina must in any conceivable event be shared by so few of our teeming populations that even the most sanguinary must realize that the time has gone by, when, by any stretch of imagination it can be regarded as a general disciplinary agent. (Applause.) And in the controversies of peace and in the bloodless struggles for the maintenance of truth and justice in our personal and civic relations, must be found the arena of the future in which character may find severer tests than ever were afforded by historic battlefield. (Great applause.)

We note with satisfaction the fact that war can now be waged only under onerous conditions, and the increasing pressure of economic considerations for the recognition of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. (Applause.) The growth of representative government, with its restraints upon the ambitions of despotism in a just appreciation of the general welfare, our complex commercial relations ignoring national boundaries, and our growing intimacies tending to make the world one society instead of a series of hostile camps (great applause) are reducing the possible causes of armed conflict and powerfully promoting the peaceful settlement of controversies.

Much can undoubtedly be accomplished by the meeting of the representatives of the nations in the direction of perfecting international law and in providing suitable conventions for the regulation of war. No doubt much that is of value can be secured in the more adequate protection of commerce and of property in time of war.

But important as are these objects, the great purpose to be achieved is the prevention of war, and not its regulation. (Great applause.)

Among nations as among men, the requirements of the sentiment of honor are subject to revision as conscience becomes more enlightened and truer conceptions of personal dignity gain place. And it may be reasonably expected that public opinion, taken in connection with the serious economic aspects of war, will gradually reduce the possible area of strife over questions thought to involve the national honor. The controversies which are incident to international business and exchanges, and those which relate to alleged violations of international agreements, may be composed without resort to arms. And without minimizing the con-

ditions which still exist, threatening the peace of the world, we have reason to congratulate ourselves that the reign of war is nearly over.

In working for the interests of peace, regard may well be had to the influences which have thus far proved so successful. The end is not to be sought through coercion, or by the vain attempt to compel peace by force, but by extending to the utmost provisions for deliberation and for conciliatory measures.

The security of peace lies in the desire of the people for peace. Protection against war can best be found in the reiterated expression of that desire throughout the nations of the earth, and by convening their representatives in frequent assemblies. Provision for stated meetings of the Peace Conference with their opportunities for interchanges of official opinion, the perfecting of plans for submissions to arbitration, and the improvement of the machinery of the International Court indicate the lines along which substantial progress may be made.

The people of the State of New York, cordial in their welcome to the delegates to this Congress, will watch its deliberations with sympathetic interest, earnestly desirous that through these meetings the united sentiment of the United States may find effective expression.

MR. CARNEGIE :

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN : I would just like to say ditto to every word that our Governor has said. (Applause.) I will only keep you a few minutes while I state that we are met to urge the speedy removal of the foulest stain that remains to disgrace humanity, since slavery was abolished—the killing of man by man in battle as a mode of settling international disputes.

This Society welcomes to membership advocates of all forms of opposition to war, from the non-resistant, to him who believes, as many of us do, that it would be our duty to fight when necessary for the enforcement of Arbitration. We prescribe no particular means of accomplishing our aim.

I belong to the class represented by the little boy who was taken to task by his Sunday School teacher for having struck Billy Johnson. "Oh, ma'am," he said, "but Billy Johnson struck me first."

"Oh, my dear, dear boy, that is no excuse for you. Remember that when one strikes you on the right cheek, you are to turn the other also."

"Oh, yes ma'am, that may be so, but Billy struck me on the nose and I have not got another nose to turn to him." (Laughter.)

We care little for the mode—everything for the result. We favor the program of the Interparliamentary Union and wish that powerful organization Godspeed. We support every proposal that makes for peace. We believe with the Prime Minister of Great Britain that:

"The sentiment in favor of peace has become incomparably stronger, and the idea of the arbitration and peaceful adjustment of international disputes has attained a practical potency and moral authority undreamed of in 1898."

We believe the psychological moment approaches when a decided step forward can be made. Personally, I am a convert to the League of Peace idea—the formation of an International Police, never for aggression, always for protection to the peace of the civilized world. It requires only the agreement of a sufficient number of nations to establish this. Since the civilized world is now united by electric bonds into one body in constant and instant communication, it is largely interdependent and rapidly becoming more so. War now involves the interests of all, and therefore one nation has no longer a right to break the peace without reference to others. Nations hereafter should be asked to remember this and not to resort to war, but to settle their disputes peacefully.

Leaving out of sight material interests, the savagery of war, from a moral and religious point of view, cries aloud to civilized man and rouses him to the firm resolve that it shall disgrace our civilization no longer. War never settles who is right but who is wrong. Might, not right, conquers.

This is no new idea, but only the extension of what has already been done. Recently six nations—Germany, Britain, France, Russia, Japan and our own country—combined their forces in China under command of a German General for a specific purpose, which was successfully accomplished. We urge this plan as the easiest and speediest means of attaining International Peace. Suppose these nations, or others, propose at the

Hague Conference that they and such other nations as concur agree to say to the world that no nation shall be permitted to disturb the peace, the nations thus combined would constitute an overwhelming force; peace would be unbroken, for resistance would be folly. Nevertheless, the overwhelming force must be in reserve, each nation agreeing when necessary to exert force to keep peace, and to contribute its agreed-upon quota, just as the six Powers did in China.

Before resorting to force it would be well to begin by proclaiming non-intercourse with the offending nation. No exchange of products, no loans, no military or naval supplies, no mails—these restrictions would serve as a solemn warning and probably prove effective. Force should always be the last resort.

Such nations as supply funds and materials of war to others might complain that their interests were unduly affected. The maintenance of peace is, however, always the greatest interest of industrial nations, because for the thousands gained from foreign wars, millions are lost. Peace is the hand-maid of Prosperity.

Let us hope this plan will be submitted to the Hague Conference by the delegates of our Republic. Then the world will know that America stands for peace through a league of powers pledged to maintain it.

Let us determine how the nations stand in regard to this. Who are for effective peace measures? Who are opposed? So holy is our cause that no avowed opponent of Peace can be found, but who will fight for it if it be broken? This is the test.

A dream, a fond dream! exclaims the pessimist. Not so fast, not so fast. Consider for a moment the first Hague Conference, which was called for the specific purpose of promoting disarmament. This proved to be a dream, but what was it that came as a reality?—the appointment of a permanent International Tribunal, a High Court of Humanity, to judge between nations and to settle their disputes peacefully—the most unexpected and the most notable of all unlooked-for advances in the history of man, a creation typified by Minerva when she sprang full-armed from the brow of Jupiter. The forming of a League of Peace at the next meeting of that body of men which produced the seemingly miraculous birth of an International Court, would pass as the next step forward in a path already marked out; the legitimate effect of the first astounding miracle. So far from its

consummation being only a dream, it is so near to reality that it lies to-day in the power of one man to found this League of Peace.

Perhaps our President may yet have that part to play. He seems born for great rôles in the world drama. He it was who breathed the breath of life into the Hague Conference by sending five leading powers to it for the settlement of their disputes; who closed the war between Russia and Japan; who recently induced Mexico and several of our neighboring Southern republics to join in remonstrance against war between two of the smaller powers. This first step in the right direction heralds the day when such intervention will be made effective by agreement between the American powers.

I do not believe that the first step that the President has taken through the Secretary of State is going to be the last; I believe that instead of a dream, we shall have an agreement which shall say to the powers of this continent, "Our interests are interdependent and the claims of humanity prevail; you shall not be allowed to disturb the peace, in the preservation of which we are all concerned."

Would that the great peacemaker of the future might be Theodore Roosevelt! Man of many triumphs, this last would lift him to the highest place in history. He is a bold man who ventures to forecast or limit the horoscope of Theodore Roosevelt.

At this moment, however, it is not in his hands but in those of the Emperor of Germany, alone of all men, that the power to abolish war seems to rest. His invitation to form a union of nations for this specific purpose would result in more than six nations gladly responding to his call. And, as in the temporary league of nations in China, so in this grander League, a German General would again rightfully command the allied forces. Much has been written and said of the Emperor as a menace to the peace of Europe, but I think, unjustly. Let me remind you, he has been nearly twenty years on the throne and, so far, is guiltless of the shedding of blood. No international war can be charged to him. His sin hereafter may be one of omission, since having been entrusted with power to abolish war, he failed to rise to this transcendent duty. Let us watch this possible man of destiny, however, and hope that a vision of his true mission may be revealed to him. A higher no man ever had, if ever

one even approached it in beneficence. Were that destiny revealed, I, for one, believe he would fulfill it. I cannot see how a mortal man could resist the divine call to perform a service so glorious. There are no victories like those of peace. The day has gone by for the heroship of such as kill and destroy. Millions of Frenchmen recently voted to determine their greatest man. Napoleon, the typical hero of barbarism, fell to seventh on the list; Pasteur, true hero of civilization, was first, and scientists and authors followed. The world advances fast toward peace.

Two remarks I wish to make. We hear from a high source that nations cannot submit all questions to arbitration. My reply to that is what the thief said to his lawyer. The lawyer asked, "What did you do?" The thief replied, "I just took a little piece of rope." "Why," said the lawyer, "they can't put you in jail for that." "Well, they have done it."

Now, we hear that nations cannot submit all questions to arbitration. Six nations in the world have already done that. (Applause.) I think that is a sufficient answer.

I have a word to add in regard to the sentiment of maintaining the honor of the country. No man ever touched another man's honor; no nation ever dishonored another nation; all honor's wounds are self-inflicted. (Applause.)

We hear a great deal about justice. Junius says, "The first principle of natural justice forbids men to be judges in their own cases." (Applause.) There is no justice when a man says, "I am right." He looks only upon the one side of the shield, self-interest. Justice is, and honor is, when a gentleman says, "You may be right, and I may be wrong; I will refer it to my friends Root and Hughes, both honest men, and what they say, Johnson, you and I will agree to." That is justice and that is honor. We don't allow a man to-day to avenge his injuries; we compel every man that speaks the English language to lay his case before a disinterested tribunal. A man who attempts to judge in his own case is radically unjust.

We hear another thing about righteousness, as if peace and righteousness could be ever divorced. (Applause.) Can you imagine the condition of a man's mind when he says that peace and good-will on earth are not the essence of the righteousness that exalts a nation? (Applause.)

We of this Arbitration and Peace Congress sadly acknowl-

edge that great evils exist in the world, but so far as this Congress and our Society are concerned, we know but one, and restrict our efforts to the removal of that alone. All speeches, all work, all contributions, are devoted to the abolition of war. We invite all men and women to join our Society and to co-operate with us in the great work before us, which we firmly believe is soon to receive the needed impulse which will bring victory. If we dedicate ourselves to the abolition of war as the members of the anti-slavery societies did to the abolition of slavery, even in our own day we who have seen the owning and selling of man by man abolished, may yet see the killing of man by man in battle no longer disgracing our common humanity.

THIRD SESSION
INTERNATIONAL VIEWS OF THE PEACE
MOVEMENT

CARNEGIE HALL

Monday Evening, April Fifteenth, at 8.15

ANDREW CARNEGIE Presiding

MR. CARNEGIE:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I see on the "Time Table" that Mr. Carnegie is allowed from 8:20 till 8:15. (Applause and laughter.) Short and sweet; Mr. Carnegie has nothing to say except to inform you of what you already know, that we are assembled to-night in the greatest of all causes, the establishment on earth of Peace and Good-will.

Your first speaker this evening is Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, who is known to all those who have the peace movement at heart in Britain, America and throughout Europe. He is one of the forthcoming class of men who may be called international men. Frenchmen who are more than Frenchmen, Germans who are more than Germans, Italians who are more than Italians, and Britons who are more than Britons, and Americans who are even more than Americans. (Applause.) And even Scotchmen (laughter) will open their hearts and try to take in something else than Scotchmen, and embrace the whole world as a brotherhood. That is our ideal and that is the ideal that brings us together to-night. Long and weary may be the path, but there is one delight however long and however weary; we will live and we will die, strong in the faith that the day is coming when man will no longer kill man like wild beasts in battle.

I now have pleasure in presenting to you Baron d'Estournelles de Constant.

Steps Toward Peace

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: (First addressing the audience in French.)

I call this a great manifestation of the good will of man. I wish I could express to you in the strongest way what I feel to-night. I am proud of the good-will manifested; I am proud because I very seldom have the honor of addressing such a brilliant assembly on the subject of Peace. In fact I am afraid you would not find such a fine assembly in Europe ready to listen to a speech on Peace, but I hope to find that here in America you can have many such audiences for such a fine question.

I wish to offer my warm congratulations to the American citizens who have organized this Congress, and especially to my eminent friend, Monsieur Carnegie. It is partly to accept his invitation I came here, although I think it is a necessary thing that a Frenchman, or a European, should see what can be done with good will and strong hearts devoted to the cause of international justice. It is admirable to think that all this has been started by men who could, as so many others in Europe, and even in America, I suppose, do—enjoy life without accomplishing anything. Monsieur Carnegie himself could simply enjoy the good rest he has deserved after such an active life; instead he thinks the time of rest has not come for him (applause), nor would he find it rest were he not doing good to others. I came partly to express my gratitude and my admiration for his valuable activity, and to say that I do not consider he is resting, I do not consider he is finishing or crowning his active life, but that he is beginning a new one for the benefit of others; the best of life, not for himself, but a life of more happiness, of better days for the people who will follow us. (Applause.)

I have had the great pleasure this afternoon of listening to Mr. Elihu Root's speech. (Applause.) In that speech Mr. Root said all I would have liked to say myself. (Applause.) Is it not very striking, that coming from France, having prepared, without saying a word about it, a very long and special speech on organization as best I could, I should find what I desired to say already expressed in the best way possible! It shows that the ocean has not prevented the best men, the men of different

nationalities from agreeing about the truth even without concerted or spoken agreement. (Applause.) In fact, as Mr. Root said, public opinion is now impressing itself even upon governments that are not willing to act peacefully. A meeting like this is a most significant manifestation; it shows that you are expecting a great deal, not of a far distant future, but, as Mr. Root said, from the coming conference at The Hague, and it shows that you are alive to its importance. That is the lesson, that is the great and useful lesson I have come to talk about here, to listen to and to carry back home. I shall tell them what I have seen and heard, and I shall repeat once more what is true, that the New World is paying its debt to the Old World by regenerating Europe. It is quite natural—there is nothing bitter in what I say—it is simply a fact that a son or a daughter must help a parent when he feels strong enough to do so.

What does it mean that we are expecting a great deal from the coming Hague Conference? How can I, who have been a representative of France and a faithful representative of France at the first Hague Conference, say this, knowing that my government and my people would not be displeased at what I say? I am sure no one will contradict me when I declare that we expect a great deal from the Hague Conference. You understand that it means a great deal. It means reasonable things; it does not mean, alas, the realization of universal peace or of disarmament. We know very well that we cannot obtain in two or three months results so far distant. We know very well that progress everywhere, and particularly in that matter, can be obtained only step by step, and we will be fortunate and satisfied and delighted if we are only sure that real progress may be obtained in the coming Hague Conference, feeling assured that after that Conference and after other conferences, and ever afterward, future generations will progress and other steps, steps we cannot even foresee now, will be taken. I will not speak of the questions Mr. Root has been speaking about this morning, especially the question of the duties and rights of neutrals and the protection of private property; and if you will allow me, I shall not speak of what they call amelioration of war; I do not believe in amelioration of war; I believe in the establishment of peace. (Applause.) People ought not to speak of humanizing war. It cannot be done. To talk of humanizing war is to dissimulate the real character of war. The worse

war appears to be, the better. We can, however, do something very useful in the way of arbitration. In arbitration a great deal has been done already, but still more can be done and will be done; and we will need to generalize arbitration so that it may apply to as many nations as possible. But this first point which was called new five or six years ago I do not need to discuss now, it is so well understood everywhere.

The second point is more complicated and not so well known. It is the question of the limitation of armaments. Of course this question cannot be settled by the Hague Conference, because it will only come about as the natural outgrowth of the adoption of arbitration. Do not believe, however, that it is useless to discuss that question at the Hague Conference. The more we discuss the question of these heavy burdens of military expenses the more the people of all nations will understand that it is to their interest to have a better organization for arbitration; so it is necessary that we speak of the question of military expenses, not only because discussion is the only way of studying the question and finding some solution for it, but because it is in this way that the methods of arbitration will be improved day by day. Those two questions of arbitration and limitation of armament are not the only questions that the Conference at The Hague has to discuss. There will be another question which is entirely new. I am speaking now on my private responsibility. It is very well to settle international difficulties by arbitration, but better than settling difficulties when they arise is to settle them before they arise. (Applause.) That is the next great step forward, and it can be attained, because everybody understands what great progress it would be. Private international conciliation is a new institution which is gaining ground in all countries. Everybody is intelligent enough to understand that it is much better to try to settle difficulties in the beginning, rather than when they have become bitter and inextricable. To settle international difficulties we require very careful organization. Many things have been done already; the Inter-Parliamentary Union, for instance, is a beginning of international conciliation. When you put in touch the members of the established parliaments, a German with a Frenchman, a Frenchman with an Englishman or an American, they discover at once that they can agree very well even if they cannot speak very well. That means that there are human weak-

nesses and good hearts everywhere. Such little facts are sometimes sufficient to be a kind of a revelation to men who have not traveled, who know foreigners only through what they learned at school. When they come home and say, "I have been received in the most charming way; I met an American mother, or an American wife, or a little girl, or one or two nice little boys," they have found out that all these wives, mothers, daughters, children, American, French, German, English are good human beings who love their parents and are devoted to each other. They remain, as I remain, a good Frenchman, but they understand that one has to be a good Frenchman in order to understand what constitutes a good American, a good Englishman, or a good German. They must understand that, and that is what they do understand when they come into these various parliaments of the old countries. It must come about in that way, because it cannot be done by the government. We must not expect everything from governments, things are to be done by ourselves, and we have to work them out. All the best people of one country, the people who work together for the best things, must learn to know each other, then they will get into good relations with people of foreign countries, and then when the good people of these foreign countries come into good relations, they will correspond, exchange visits, become acquainted, discover, as I remarked just now, that there are good people everywhere. Then there will be immense progress, and the bad people, these people who want war, will find it is not so easy to deceive those who are united in this international conciliation. They are already instructed, they know the truth. If they read in newspapers things that are not true, they say to one another, "That is a lie, you must not follow that paper," and such discrimination is enough to prevent difficulties which, not long ago, were sufficient to make two good nations go to war.

Now, I say that if the Hague Conference can do only these things—generalize arbitration, affirm the necessity of discussing and of settling the question of the limitation of armament, and give its official sympathy to the organization of international conciliation, the rest will work out.

We see what has been done in the last six years through the American initiative alone—the Hague Conference, the Hague Court, and the beautiful palace which that noble citizen, Mr. Carnegie, has given for its dwelling place. We see that this

help comes from all the different people in the world and chiefly from America. I want to thank you again for this manifestation which shows more than ever that you believe in the future, not only the future of the Hague Conference, but of all the organizations interested in establishing peace. They will succeed in the future as they have succeeded so rapidly in the past, through American help.

MR. CARNEGIE:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: This afternoon we had the great pleasure and privilege of hearing a Cabinet Minister from New York. This evening we are to have a similar pleasure and privilege in hearing another Cabinet Minister from New York. I spoke to-day, when Governor Hughes addressed the meeting, of two classes of politicians—one who sought the office, and the other whom the office sought. The office sought Governor Hughes, it sought Mr. Root, and it also sought my friend, Mr. Straus, whom I now have the great pleasure of introducing to you.

The Peace of Nations and Peace Within Nations

HON. OSCAR S. STRAUS

Nations, like individuals, pass through stages of development, and each stage of that development is characterized by different and often varying aspirations. Beginning with modern times, with the Reformation, the nations were held under the spell of ecclesiastical domination, which produced the so-called religious wars which culminated with the Thirty Years' War and the Treaty of Westphalia. This was followed by the hunger for power, which rose to its height under the infuriated heroism of the Napoleonic wars; after this followed the period of industrialism and trade expansion, at the height of which we now find ourselves. This last period, which has witnessed the development of great industrial combinations, has also witnessed the development of the powers of the wage-earners under organized labor. This development, to which the most advanced nations of the world owe the wonderful growth of their material prosperity, brings with it many advantages, also serious dangers, which, if not regulated by humane considerations and by the spirit of equity and justice, threaten the most serious domestic conflicts.

Unrest and dissatisfaction at home breed antagonisms abroad. The nation happy and contented within its borders is never a menace to neighboring nations. Its chief danger lies in not being able to protect itself against the discontentment of other nations, and nothing contributes more to peace than peace at home. Often in the past has a nation gone to war or been driven into war by reason of internal discontent, compelling it, as it were, to choose war without as the lesser evil in order to avert revolution within its borders.

On the 10th of December last the Committee elected by the Norwegian Storthing, under the will of Alfred Bernhard Nobel, for the distribution of the Peace Prize "to be awarded to the person who shall have most or best promoted the fraternity of nations and the abolishment or diminution of standing armies and the formation and increase of peace congresses," awarded its prize to the person who did most throughout the entire world to promote those objects, and selected as its recipient Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States. The people throughout this country and from one end of the world to the other applaudingly approved the selection. They recognized that he first, among presidents, kings and emperors, opened the doors of the Hague Tribunal; that he, through his tactful initiative and mediation, brought about peace between Japan and Russia, and that he was the first to summon the second great peace congress, and in the interest of international good will resigned the high privilege to the Czar of Russia. By these separate acts he thrice deserved the gratitude of the peace-loving world and thrice justified the award of the Norwegian Storthing.

Fully as important as peace among nations is peace within nations. People who are subjected to unreasonable restrictions upon "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," and who are compelled to live under such conditions that they cannot earn their daily bread, become revolutionary. He who had intervened and brought about an equitable adjustment in the greatest industrial struggle of modern times—the anthracite coal strike—dedicated the Nobel Peace Prize to the promotion of industrial peace, and by an act of Congress approved March 2 last, this Foundation for the Promotion of Industrial Peace was made perpetual, with the purpose of aiding the industrial forces to arrive at a peaceful adjustment of their reciprocal rights on a basis of

humanity and justice. In Theodore Roosevelt are united the historical foresight of a Jefferson with the humane consideration of a Lincoln for the welfare of the masses. He is ever watchful to protect the poor man as well as the rich man in his rights and to restrain them from committing wrong.

The growth of commerce and industry which marks our industrial age has contributed tremendously to the community of nations. The much decried commercial spirit is the surest guaranty for peace. Before its development the panoplied statesmen believed the weaker and poorer other countries were, the stronger and mightier would be their own; but the economics of commerce have shown that the wealth and progress of other lands are the direct source of wealth and progress of one's own land.

The wealth and happiness of nations are based upon factors that are international as well as intra-national; in other words, they depend not only upon domestic commerce, but also and to an equal degree upon foreign commerce. As an illustration, we have only to take into consideration the fact that within the last forty years the foreign commerce of the United States has grown over 400 per cent.—from 591 millions in 1866 to 2,636 millions in 1905.

Equally important with, if not more so than, the limitation of armaments is to raise the standards of international morality. Let the nations exact the same standard from one another as they exact from their own subjects, substitute international morality for international expediency, and they will have instead of the arbitrament of war the arbitrament of law. The first step to this end is to enlarge and expand the laws of neutral obligations. Why should a nation be permitted to go to war to collect a debt at the mouth of a cannon when that same nation will not allow its own subjects to collect debts from one another with swords and pistols? The Drago Doctrine is in the interest of international morality. The casuistry of international pettifogism has whittled down the principles of international law. Natural rights have been expanded in the interest of greed, and neutral obligations have been cramped and distorted, so that as the law stands now neutral nations may not sell ships of war and arms to belligerents, but the subjects of neutral nations may. Neutral nations may not grant loans and subsidies to belligerents, but the banker subjects of neutral nations may. The doctrine recognized under all sys-

tems of law, *facit per alios facit per se*, does not apply to international relations, because international relations still carry the taints of unmoral precedents and piratical plunder.

"The true end of every great and free people should be self-respecting peace. * * * Probably no other great nation of the world is so anxious for peace as we are." These are the sentiments of President Roosevelt in his message to the Fifty-seventh Congress. The argument that war will kill war is about as sane as to claim that contagion will cure disease. The best guaranty for peace is peace, and the very fact that behind the world's diplomacy stand ever open the doors of the Hague Tribunal, whose permanent mission—the peaceful adjustment of international differences—cannot fail to have an ever-increasing voice in the chancelleries of nations and in elevating the international morality of the civilized countries of the world.

MR. CARNEGIE :

How much good it does the speaker when he has to stand up and bow (this was said apropos of Mr. Straus' being compelled to bow in response to the applause which followed his address).

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are to hear from Professor Münsterberg, whose writings most of you are familiar with. He comes to-night to address us, and give us the German view of things.

He is to be followed by Dr. Richard, the first President of a Peace Society in New York—the German Peace Society. We shall hear from Professor Münsterberg of Harvard University.

Germany : a Land of Peace and Industry

PROFESSOR HUGO MÜNSTERBERG

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Your Congress has honored me with a generous invitation to express the hope for peace from a German point of view. Yet the leaders of the great Congress know that I am in no sense a delegate of the German government or of the German nation; that I can speak only as one of the masses and, moreover, as one who for the larger part of the year is separated by the ocean from his Fatherland. But I suppose you made this selection because my professional work belongs to philosophy and I ought therefore to be influenced by the spirit of the greatest German in the two thousand

years of German history, the philosopher Immanuel Kant. Kant's book on "The Eternal Peace"—I do not forget, Mr. President, that there was not a little Scotch blood in his veins—is indeed the profoundest argument which has been brought forward for the harmony of nations; and his postulates, of which the entire abolition of standing armies is only one, are deduced from the supreme principle of eternal justice. And this spirit of Kant, this belief in justice, and this abhorrence of immoral wars, is still to-day a deep emotion of the German people. Every movement which strengthens moral peace on earth, therefore, finds in us Germans willing friends and supporters.

But to support a movement ought to mean, first of all, to remove from it all misunderstandings and all illusions, inasmuch as every illusion must ultimately work as an obstacle to real progress. I therefore feel it is my duty to point first to some mistaken arguments by which the missionaries of the peace movement too often weaken their influence on the German nation. I know, of course, that every word of this kind must be unpopular; yet I say it frankly at once: the German army is not felt by the nation as a disagreeable burden. On the contrary, the years in the army constitute a national school time which keeps body and soul in strength and vigor. The years in the army are a time of pride for the overwhelming mass of the German people. In the same way, it is not true that the material sacrifice has become too exorbitant. Germany is prosperous to-day and the expenses of the army are felt by the nation hardly more than fire insurance is felt by a good householder. Nor does the time lost through the years of service much impair the national economy in a country whose population grows so rapidly. And even if it ever came to war, the mere question of loss of property and life would not count overmuch. Disease and even recklessness kill many more in the midst of hopeful life. American railroads have brought more avoidable injury and death than American cannons, and the progress of German pathology through the work of Virchow, Koch, Behring, etc., has saved more lives than the avoidance of the last wars could have done.

Such materialistic arguments must remain ever ineffective if the core of the German nation is to be reached. For the best Germans it is entirely a moral question, as it was with Kant. But just therefore it is impossible for the German to say that

war is the worst evil under all circumstances. Immanuel Kant had no more idealistic apostles than Schiller and Fichte. But it was Fichte, more than any one, who, by his orations to the German nation, stirred his countrymen to the war which liberated the indignant people from the humiliation of Napoleon's yoke; and Schiller cried unto the soul of every German youth: Infamous the nation which does not sacrifice everything for her moral integrity. To the German, war seems like a disease which threatens life, but with Schiller, he feels that life is not the greatest of all good, and that the greatest of all evils is unrighteousness. If these idealistic convictions of the German soul were better understood, the friends of peace would be much better able to put the lever on the right spot instead of losing ground by useless appeals to merely utilitarian motives.

But just because war and peace are for the soul of the German nation first of all an ethical problem, it is utterly absurd to be suspicious of German motives and to look to Germany as a possible source of danger to the peace of the world. Mr. President, I do not hesitate to claim that there is no firmer bulwark of peace than the good will and sincerity of the whole German nation, and there is no more reckless and more inexcusable menace to peace than the foolish denunciation of German motives which abounds in the newspapers and assemblies of many lands, and of America not least. Unfair rumors are easily started, and denials follow slowly and clumsily; Mr. President, we need a simplified denying board. I said the central motive of Germany's desire not to disturb the peace is her strong will for righteousness; but let us not forget that even if that were lacking there is nothing which might spur the German mind to an avoidable war. The Latin temperament is easily excited, but the German is phlegmatic; the Anglo-Saxon temperament likes betting and sport and seeks to outdo a rival, but the quiet Germans prefer to do the good things for their own sake. There may be peoples which need war to overcome internal troubles, but the German inner life is prosperous and harmonious: there may be peoples which seek war for expansion, but the Germans have large colonies, the building up of which is still to do and occupies them fully. The whole national life is adjusted to assiduous labor which needs the repose of peace. Commerce and industry, science and art, law and religion, inner freedom

and social harmonization engage the German mind to-day more earnestly and intensely than ever before; its inner and outer development were never before moving on in such a wonderful rhythm; there is the one need only, to be left in the sunshine of peace. And whoever has the hallucination of secret disturbing plans brooding in Germany falsifies history and endangers the future.

It does not follow that everyone in Germany is enthusiastic over every scheme of arbitration, although the movement for international arbitration has a daily growing body of warm supporters in Germany. There lurks still the instinctive feeling in some German quarters that it is impossible to give an international court the same degree of impartiality which we expect from a civil judge; the interests of all nations are too much interwoven; the judge is always to a certain degree, a party. The forcing of the issue to arbitration sometimes suggests, therefore, the suspicion of selfish politics. Not everybody desires, moreover, for patriotic conflicts the arts of wrangling attorneys and of dissenting experts who may have to decide whether or not there was a national brain storm going on. The Germans feel, therefore, that there is one way still better than to arbitrate in quarrels, namely, to avoid quarrels from the start.

Do not German tariff negotiations with the United States testify to this point? Yes, does not history show it everywhere with proud and blessed results? If we look back over the last third of a century, we see great and minor wars. England, Russia, Turkey, Italy, Spain, France, Japan, China, even America, had wars, but the German nation went quietly along in peace. And the spirit of this new Germany which longs to work and not to quarrel, has found its highest symbol in the genius on the Empire's throne. How did the prejudices of the world denounce him as the war lord of our time, and how has he shown in firmness and strength that his reign is the most powerful influence for peace and international friendship! This country knows the story; this country knows how the Emperor sent here his brother and his friends, sent scholars and artists, sent sporting yachts, and museum treasures, and a warship only to go to the peaceful celebration of Jamestown. It is high time to drown the wicked prejudices; if the world could see at last the true spirit of Germany, freed from all willful distortion, a mighty step forward

would be secured in your holy movement. Yes, if a sculptor were to create to-day a statue of the Goddess of Peace, he might safely choose as his model fair Germania, with the Emperor's crown on her head, with a pure sword in her hand, and with mild eyes calmly looking on a serious yet happy nation of laborers who work for the eternal good of peaceful civilization.

MR. CARNEGIE :

I had occasion this afternoon to call attention to the fact which the Professor referred to just now, that the Emperor had been on the throne nearly twenty years yet his hands were guiltless of human blood.

With much that he has said, of course, I am in full accord, because I have tried my best in writing to Great Britain to convince them that they were most unjust to Germany and to her Emperor. I believe he is a son of destiny; that he has it in his power to-day to bring Peace upon earth. His sin may be the sin of omission if he does not exert that power. Let the German Emperor to-day say to Britain, to France, to America: "Come, let us declare to the world that nations are interdependent and rapidly becoming more so. No nation has the right to disturb the general peace of the world, in which every nation is more or less concerned."

Should the German Emperor say that, we could repeat what we did in China when a German general led the forces of six great nations to accomplish a successful mission. The easiest and best way of accomplishing Peace on earth is to have an international police force to be used as the last resort. The nation which breaks the Peace would then be punished.

I have heard Professor Münsterberg make the most extraordinary statement that I have heard for a long time: that conscription in Germany was not regarded as a great burden. I should like to have the gentleman visit our mills in Pittsburg and ask thousands and thousands of Germans what influenced them to leave Germany for this land. (Patting Professor Münsterberg on the shoulder.) (Applause.)

I had in the beginning a German partner—I have had many German partners and several of them are millionaires to-day—and I have asked them and also the men in the mills: "What made you leave Germany?" and they have answered: "Mr.

Carnegie, I have two boys; I would not have them in the barracks." (Applause.) You know little of this when you sit in your studies and write from your own minds, but the man of affairs knows whether conscription in Germany is a burden or not; and I have said to myself what Bismarck said: "America is draining Germany of its best blood"; we were, and are, 57,000 on the average leave Germany every year, and 20,000 come under the Stars and Stripes. I wish there were as many millions of them.

I appreciate the German Emperor as much as Professor Münsterberg does. I have faith in the German Emperor, as he has, and I look to him to play a great part in the world; but it is too late in the day for any professor to tell me that conscription is not draining Germany of its best blood. I go against his theory and give you facts.

I will now call upon another German, the first man to organize a German-American Peace Society, Dr. Ernst Richard.

Germany and America

DR. ERNST RICHARD.

Professor Münsterberg has talked to you on behalf of his countrymen in Germany; he has described to you what is, unhappily but most decidedly, the attitude of many thinking Germans to-day in regard to the question of peace or war. If you will review the history of Germany for the last three hundred years and see the misery, the depredations on property, the humiliations Germany has had to suffer, when it was not strong enough to defend itself, you will understand why it is that Germans are not over-ready to trust in the peaceful assertions of their neighbors.

This feeling is not peculiar to the Germans, you may see from the fact that even those countries whose neutrality is guaranteed by all the great powers surrounding them, maintain a military establishment that burdens them to the extent of their economic capacity and beyond. But Kant, our great philosopher, has not been forgotten in Germany, and there are to-day an increasing number of Germans who know that better ways exist to secure peace than militarism; who know as well as we do, in spite of all possible assertions of military statesmen, that soldiers

are no instruments of peace. To speak with Elbert Hubbard, soldiers who do not like to fight are like preachers who do not like to preach, like musicians who do not care for the art of music.

I am talking to you in behalf of those Germans, and perhaps I may say of all those of foreign nationality who have come here and have forgotten their antagonism without giving up their national traditions. As far as they are in agreement with progressive and liberal institutions they are united as good citizens into one great nation of the United States of America. (Applause.) We who come from monarchical countries are wide-awake to the fact that in countries of monarchical traditions the responsibilities of sovereignty rest on the shoulders of the administration; but in a democracy like ours they rest on the people, they rest on ourselves. If we go to war, we cannot blame our administration, we have to blame ourselves; and if this national congress has any meaning whatever it is to tell our mandatories in Washington that we feel the people of the United States are with us in demanding that our representatives to the Second Hague Conference shall be as they have been in the past, the leaders in the reforms of international relations. (Applause.)

I have been introduced to you as President of the German-American Peace Society, but I should like to tell you that the name "German-American" does not in this instance, even in an ethnological sense, mean a distinction from our fellow citizens, but a recognition of the fact that we who have descended from German stock are the natural bond of an ever-increasing friendship between America and Germany. We hope that our fellow citizens of other nationalities will follow our example, and that altogether we may point to this object lesson of the solidarity of the nations in our United States of America and ask: "Why are there not United States of Europe?" (Applause.)

When we started, we found the first thing to do in this American city was to have an American Peace Society right amongst us, a purely American Peace Society, and if we have done nothing else we have founded the Peace Society of the City of New York, which fathers this congress, and so we may very well call ourselves the grandparents of this National Arbitration and Peace Congress.

Perhaps it is not accidental that German-Americans should be the first to have entered this field, since Germany and America

have progressed arm in arm in the paths of peace since these United States have been recognized as one of the sovereign nations of the world.

Practically the first state that recognized the sovereignty of the United States, and gave expression to this recognition, was the state of Frederick the Great, from whose reign Germany took its new flight of progress and growth. At the same time the American eagle began to spread its wings, and it is very appropriate to recall on this occasion one clause of the treaty of 1785 which, as far as I know, is legally in force to-day; the clause which expresses the principle for which this nation has stood since its birth, and which, up to this time, has not been acknowledged as an integral part of international law. In this treaty of 1785 the United States and Prussia (which stands for the Germany of to-day) guaranteed mutually the inviolability of private property at sea. As the international law stands to-day, your house and its contents may be safe from the attacks of an army in time of war, if you are a private citizen, but it will not be safe against the shells of a warship, and your merchantmen, no matter how harmless are the goods they carry, may be destroyed or robbed by the enemy or his privateers at any time during the war. We hear so much of the question of national honor on the part of those who want to reserve at least a few cases in which they can legally fly at each other's throats. If there ever were a question of national honor for the United States it is to assert this principle which it has held up to the nations since the first days of its existence, and which stands again on the platform of the next Hague Conference. It seems to me that, above all, our delegates ought to be instructed to see that at last this principle shall be acknowledged by the agreement of the civilized nations.

I appeal to you, the representatives of the magnanimous nation, related both to Germany and to America, to the representatives of Great Britain, to raise your voice in the councils of your nation and take care that at the next Hague Conference the only great Power which has been in the way of the establishment of this great principle will at last give up its resistance and thus show to all the world that its will for peace is really "indomitable" and "invincible."

Our country and Germany have adhered to this rule since it was laid down in that treaty of 1785 and have acted accordingly throughout their history.

Let me tell you that there is only one way leading to disarmament or to the limitation of armament, and that is to take away excuses for armament and to trust to the common sense of the German people and all the other peoples who show that they want to advance in the ways of peace and civilization, and to drop the military burden when they see that it is not necessary. The danger to private property affords the most frequent and the most dangerous excuse for the increase at least of naval armaments. But we must hurry that events shall not overtake our efforts at peaceful settlement. New ties of international friendship, of common interests are being formed. International institutions are in existence to-day supported by all or at least a great number of the great nations of the world which will lead inevitably to a World Organization such as we dream of as our ideal.

A few months ago there were unveiled two monuments over the graves of French soldiers who had died on German soil during the war of 1870, and it was on this occasion, speaking on behalf of the Emperor, that a German general, depositing a wreath on the grave, said: "What is the language of these monuments? That it is not by battles but by a pacific union that the peoples of Europe will after this accomplish their high mission of civilization and of progress, which calls them and claims all their efforts." I conclude with these words of the German Emperor, with this change, that we do not speak of the pacific union of the people of Europe alone, but of the pacific union of the whole civilized world.

Before I close let me refer to the part the German Emperor took in the great work of concluding the Peace of Portsmouth, when President Roosevelt found it impossible to finish his task and the Russian representative had received orders to leave within three days. It was then that our President appealed to the German Emperor to help him with his influence, and through his successful intervention the baneful order was withdrawn. (Applause.)

Thus, you may say at the beginning of our national existence as well as at the present time, we find the United States and

Germany shoulder to shoulder in the task of promoting peace and diminishing the horrors of war; and as a testimony for the spirit of this so-called "War Lord," let me say to you that in spite of the dreadful military power behind which Germany tries to guard itself, our own ideals of the World's Federation are alive there as well as here.

MR. CARNEGIE:

There is some complaint from the gallery that they do not hear these speakers well. Now, we have an original in the gallery, Mr. Stead, and he suggests that he will speak from where he stands, and enable his neighbors to hear the weighty message he is going to deliver. I have great pleasure in introducing to you one of the most ardent spirits I know among all my friends. (Great Applause.)

MR. STEAD:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I don't know whether everyone in this great hall can hear my voice, speaking as I do, but if I should, by any accident, drop my voice so that you cannot hear it, will you be good enough to shout out quick and sharp "speak up." (Laughter.) I have ten minutes allotted to me in which to speak to you, so I beg you sincerely not to rob me of any of my ten minutes by any applause. Now, Mr. Chairman, will you kindly look at your watch and if they take any of my ten minutes, will you add that on? (Laughter.)

I am here, in a certain sense, not as the representative of the British government; I never represented a government in my life, and I hope sincerely I never shall (laughter), preferring, as I do, the position of much greater freedom than that which belongs to any representative of any government. No, I speak not for the government, I speak for the people. (Applause.) I stand here as an Englishman to appeal to you who are all or almost all English-speaking people, to join hand in hand with my countrymen to make this next Hague Conference even more memorable in the history of the world than the first Hague Conference, which owed its success, not its initiative, but its success to the fact that the United States and Great Britain stood together hand in hand as brothers true and tried before the nations of the world.

The first thing to be done is to have a program. Although

I was delighted with the Chairman's fraternal rebuke to Professor Münsterberg, nevertheless I was extremely glad to hear what Professor Münsterberg said, because he reminded you of some facts, which, in a meeting like this where we are all very enthusiastic and very much of one mind, we are apt to forget—he reminded you, for instance, that in a meeting which wishes to do anything practical, the word "disarmament" should never be spoken at all. (Applause.) I have been around Europe and I have talked in every capital of Europe, and I came to hate the word disarmament as a devil hates holy water (laughter), because the moment you talk about disarmament, people think you are going to ask them to disband their armies, and stand defenseless against their neighbors whom they do not trust. I suppose no government in the world is going to propose this at the Hague Conference, no government in the world, certainly not our own, is going to be so foolish as to run its head against a stone wall by proposing that any power should disarm. Now, you don't like that, some of you (laughter), but it is a hard, cold fact. What are we, then, going to propose?—not that there should be any disarmaments, not that there should be any reduction of armaments; but simply that we should attempt to agree to prevent the continual, the mad, reckless increase of armaments which goes on year after year. (Applause.)

It was proposed at the last Hague Conference that the Powers should arrest their armaments; everyone agreed that it was very necessary, but they could not agree as to the form in which it was to be arranged, so it was referred to each of the governments to decide, to discuss, and to arrange. Ever since, the cost of armaments has gone up steadily, averaging for the last eight years fifty million dollars a year increase over and above that which was regarded in 1898 as an intolerable burden.

Professor Münsterberg said that the Germans regarded the cost of the army and navy as insurance against fire risks. I agree, but is it rational that when a fire risk has gone down, the insurance premium should go up? (Laughter—applause.) Are we not as business men, practical men, entitled to ask that we should at least discuss whether in proportion as the world grows more peaceful, we might not at least arrange to stand by the maximum we have at present arrived at and agree for the term of the next five years that we will not exceed it? Believe me,

for two months there has been very little else debated and argued between the great powers of Europe, except whether or not we should have permission even to discuss that, because Professor Münsterberg's country did not think it was a practical proposition. Now, so much for argument.

There is another question. Professor Münsterberg told us, and I believe, quite truly, that the German Emperor is a friend of peace. I know that when I was in Germany I found the opinion of the Germans upon that subject absolutely unanimous; and many of the Germans with whom I talked admitted it ruefully, not liking it at all, saying that they thought that their Emperor's peace-loving character was so well known by other nations that they traded upon it. (Laughter.) But all the same, Professor Münsterberg will admit that twelve months ago this very time there was hardly a Frenchman in all France who did not open his newspaper every morning expecting to find that the peace-loving Emperor had landed his indomitable army across the French frontiers. And why was there that dread? Why was there that great fear? I was talking to the most capable Foreign Minister of the German Empire. He admitted it was perfectly true the French did fear war was coming with Germany, that the German troops were meditating full march on Paris at any moment; but he said there was no ground for that because he said he had been with the Emperor during the whole of that three months and never by word or sign did the Emperor ever show to even his most trusted Minister that he regarded war with France a possibility. (Applause.)

If there could be that great misunderstanding and dread, that great horror of a possible war, which was not by any means confined to France, but existed in many other countries—My time is up. (Cries of "Go on! Go on!")

MR. CARNEGIE :

That man Stead could keep you here an hour; he is wonderful, and he has been speaking ever since he landed in this country; and some of us, careful of his health, are taking care to limit him. Besides, we have other speakers and I would like very much to hear him myself, but I must really ask you to allow the

From Stereograph, Copyright 1897, by Underwood & Underwood, New York

W. T. STEAD

SIR WILLIAM HENRY PREBCE, F.R.S.

COL. SIR ROBERT CRANSTON

DR. JOHN RHYS

SIR ROBERT BALL, F.R.S.

other speakers to speak; it is now after 10 o'clock, and all well-regulated families should have the heads of the families at home before 11 o'clock. We will now hear——

MR. STEAD:

Mr. Carnegie, just one word more: I have obeyed and am always ready to obey the ruling of the Chair, but I wish to make a suggestion to the Chair that when he exercises his rulings and insists, quite properly, upon the time table being adhered to, he should not apply it so hard upon me as to put it upon his regard for my health; and I have further to say to you that as he has done so, I only think it right to make this fair offer to him and this meeting, that after you have gotten through with the other speakers to-night, if you would like to stop and hear me, I am game to speak as long as you will listen.

MR. CARNEGIE:

Mr. Stead is going to have numerous opportunities to speak at other meetings; we are holding him in reserve.

I have now the honor of calling upon Colonel Sir Robert Cranston, Ex-Lord Provost of Edinburgh. You have not heard one word from Scotland to-night. You have heard from Germany, and you have heard from England, and now you will listen for a few minutes to a word from Scotland, so I call upon the next speaker, Sir Robert Cranston, of Edinburgh, to speak for ten minutes.

SIR ROBERT CRANSTON:

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I would very much rather that Mr. Stead had gone on. He plays the game so well that there is no chance for a serious man to come in. I can say that to him, and he won't be offended; I know all about him; but it is hardly fair that after you have heard from all the other countries in the world, except Scotland, that I should come in at the tail end, after every argument has been given and everything has been said that could possibly be said.

I remember the story of a gentleman dying and leaving his family of seven to select from what he had left, beginning with the eldest. I am exactly in the position of the seventh, who found very little left to select from. I think I speak pretty well for the nation to which I belong, perhaps the nation in the world

above all other nations, which has given the most blood for civil and religious liberty, when I say that they would to-morrow welcome peace throughout the world.

I am also thoroughly convinced (and I stand in a rather peculiar position) that there exists no man, whether in France, Germany, America or anywhere else, that is a stronger advocate of peace than King Edward, who prays night and day for the welfare of his people and for universal peace.

You know as well as I do that the time for disarmament has not yet come. I understand that this meeting is a meeting to protest against war, regarding a state of peace as the logical well-being of every nation.

Someone has said: "Give me the money that has been spent in war, and I will purchase every foot of land upon the globe; I will clothe every man, woman and child in an attire of which kings and queens would be proud; I will build a school-house on every hillside and in every valley over the whole earth; I will build an academy in every town and endow a college in every State."

I do not wish to be a sycophant to you or any other man in this country or in any other country, but I believe the way to obtain peace has been taken by the man who occupies the Chair to-night (applause); it is to build libraries, endow schools, erect colleges and try to permeate every man and woman with the higher ideals of life, then armaments will fall to pieces; for, peace having been declared between nation and nation, there will be no further need for armament or for discussion of armament. (Applause.) I believe honestly and truly that so long as we have people whose money is spent for the welfare of the people in the way it has been spent in this country and in many other countries, so long as we have big-hearted monarchs or Presidents of Republics, as they may be, and governments full of heart and soul, telling the people what they should live up to, and ministers of the Gospel telling men how to live rather than how to die (applause) we will have an exemplification of justice between man and man. To me it is the realization of the words that Burns wrote, 137 years ago:

"It is coming yet for a' that
For man to man the world o'er
Shall brothers be for a' that."

MR. CARNEGIE:

Well, I am not so sorry now as I thought I was, and as you thought you were when Mr. Stead was stopped; I think we got as good an oration, equal even to anything that that celebrated orator could have given us.

Gentlemen, we have with us to-night a man who has made a deep impression upon us in the literary field; he was at Pittsburgh, and I heard him the other night make his first speech in public, and I have had a great many requests from others that he should be heard on the metropolitan stage. We give him now the finest audience that he can find, and we ask him for ten minutes to say a few words to us—Mr. "Maarten Maartens."

"MAARTEN MAARTENS" (MR. VAN DER POORTEN-SCHWARTZ):

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: My rising here to speak at all, is, when you look at it properly and rationally, quite a strong argument for the impression made by this great movement; for, as you have just heard, I never spoke in public before I came to America a few days ago, and the chances are ten to one that when I once leave the country I shall never speak in public again. I have no claim upon your attention, these are important matters that are before you; all the men who have spoken hitherto are men who have spoken officially or have done something in this great work. Why do I speak at all?—it is, I think, because when this demand for peace comes before us, no man who thinks or speaks has a right to keep silent. It is because we are disciples, for I am one of you; I am not one of the gentlemen who know all about the matter, but I am one of the audience, and possibly it is because we people at last have begun to see that if we kept silent, the stones would cry out.

It is only a very short time ago that I trod the deck of one of the great Atlantic liners; I saw how much has been accomplished in a few years. I thought of what these vessels were twenty years ago; I realized the enormous improvements that have been made, it seemed as though everything had been done for comfort and for safety. Hardly had we left the harbor when the storms of heaven swept down upon us and the waters arose and for two days we passed through fierce gales and for two days afterward through thick fogs, and my thoughts were all the time

of the man on the bridge—the captain. One mistake, and perhaps that great living, throbbing organism, with its three thousand souls, would go crashing down to sudden wreck.

So, men and women, the blessing we enjoy in these times. The great Ship of State, has started off; we know that any moment the winds of avarice may rush down upon it; we know that the waters of Envy may arise—we trust our captains, but we also hold our breath as we think of the oceans of human folly and of the tempest of human crime.

We are told, I have often been told, that the men at the head of this movement are theorists, men who do not reckon with hard facts, but it seems to me rather that they are men who have learned how to judge men. All of them can say they have fought many a successful battle, brought many a prosperous bark into port, but because such tasks are difficult they wish to do this work. They know the tempest will come, they know any time war may break out, and that is why they resolve to stop war; to destroy the powers of darkness arrayed against one another. Gentlemen, we are resolved to give the men who are doing this work our hearty co-operation. Because these ideas are so difficult to achieve, therefore we strive for them, knowing that a cause has often gained more through honest ridicule and honest opposition than through empty applause and too easy and insincere adherence.

MR. CARNEGIE :

Last but not least the celebrated astronomer, a man who is perhaps better known in Great Britain, in every town in Britain, than any other man, who has brought to light the mysteries of astronomy and explained them to more people than any other man living. I am very happy to say that Sir Robert Ball, Professor of Astronomy at Cambridge University, will now consume ten minutes of your time.

The Evolution of Warfare

SIR ROBERT BALL

I gladly avail myself of the permission to say a few words on this occasion. I do so with the object of tracing the bearings of the doctrine of evolution on the question of transcendent importance which has brought us together.

The immortal doctrine of Darwin has much to tell us, not, perhaps, on the doctrine of peace, but on the doctrine of war. I hope you will not be shocked at what I am going to say. If you are I cannot help it, for I am determined at all hazards to say what I want to say. It would be an affront to this audience not to speak from this platform the exact truth so far as I have been able to learn it. I am encouraged by the reflection that the moral I shall draw will not be different from that of the other speakers who have addressed you on this memorable occasion to discuss the sublime theme before us.

The teachings of history have occasionally been mentioned by other speakers; but the history to which I now invite your attention is not the flutter of a few paltry centuries, nor even of a few score of centuries, like the period during which man has strutted his little hour on this planet.

Some of us can trace our ancestry back a few generations and there are those who can trace an ancestry back for many generations. But after all, how short, as compared with geological time, is the vista thus opened up.

The bluest blood among us has not the slightest idea of what his ancestors were like one hundred generations back: let us say in 1000 B. C. But what an insignificant trifle is 3,000 years in comparison with the immemorial ages which have been required for the evolution of the human species. I want you to think of that critical period of earth history, I know not how many hundreds of thousands of years ago, when a being capable of reason was evolved from the lower forms of life.

From this point when man first began to exist, our retrospect of ancestry extends through myriads of generations. Not to be too vague, let us concentrate our attention on one particular date, I cannot tell you the exact date, but we can define it sufficiently for our present purpose. It is a date of much interest to us in connection with the recent celebrations in which so many of us had the honor of participating. The date I refer to is that when that truly majestic animal the *Diplocodus Carnegii* adorned the plains of Wyoming with his dignified presence.

Every one of us had, we must have had, a direct lineal ancestor living in those days many millions of years ago, when that monster reptile swam in the rivers, or wallowed in the

swamps. I am not intending to suggest that the *Diplocodus Carnegii* was one of our forefathers. I wish I could think that the ancestor we had at that time was anything like so respectable as the *Diplocodus*. The rudimentary man was some small and miserable creature which the *Diplocodus Carnegii* would not have deigned to notice, nevertheless we should like to see his photograph.

The period of the vast reptiles, though ancient beyond all human standards, was still quite recent in comparison with the earlier stretches of time during which the evolution was proceeding. Back again through hundreds and thousands and millions of generations our retrospect must be carried through organisms ever simpler and simpler in structure until at last the dawn of life commenced, at some period so remote that Haeckel and Gadow estimate that not less than five million generations of living forms have culminated in the man of the present hour.

Think of it, you and I and even the Chairman have descended through a prodigious ancestry of some five million generations. You know something of two or three or four or perhaps a few more. But even he whose ancestral mansion is lined with pictures of his forebears knows of his ancestry less than the fifty-thousandth part. The pictures of the rest he has not got. Even the arboreal members he would perhaps not care to have on his walls.

You, perhaps, who pride yourselves on long series of ancestors, will please observe that your knowledge of your ancestry is so infinitesimal that you are little better than the rest of us.

Fortunately for our present purpose we are not totally ignorant of our five million ancestors. We do know quite enough to teach us the merits of peace.

Civilized warfare would mean that the rich in body or mind or in moral nature must not be cured, they must be destroyed; the weaker races according to natural warfare must not only be conquered, they must be annihilated. We shudder at natural warfare, we will have none of it, we will not even listen to it.

The warfare of civilized man is conducted according to the principles of chivalry. The non-combatants are not to be slaughtered. Their weakness is their protection. Civilized man for his warfare picks out all his strongest and best men, exposes them to all the risks of conflict while the weaker man is pro-

tected. Thus the race is not improved, it is deteriorated by warfare as conducted by civilized man. The conclusion, now, is obvious. By the natural warfare the human race has been created. The chivalrous warfare is conducted on principles quite wrong from the doctrine of the survival of the fittest. If, therefore, civilized man now conducts war it is against nature. The human race must pay the penalty. The moral law forbids us to purchase future improvements of the human race at the appalling price demanded by natural warfare.

With no less force does the polity of nations demand that chivalrous war must cease, as by its means the human race will infallibly deteriorate.

Do you, my friends, suppose that all your five million ancestors were estimable and worthy men of peace, or rather shall we say creatures of peace, diffusing nothing but beneficent love and kindness all around them, creatures who after a long life devoted to the pursuit of every virtue, at last closed their eyes in their beds amid the affectionate sobs of a family circle?

Shall I tell you the truth about your ancestors or mine? It is just this: out of every thousand of them, nine hundred and ninety-nine passed their lives in trying to kill other creatures or trying to avoid being killed themselves. Battle and murder, treachery and assassination, sudden and often cruel death cut short their lives. The close of their careers was anything but the beautiful scene I endeavored to indicate. They did not die peaceably in their beds. I cannot indeed say they died in their boots. They did not wear boots. If they had done so, they would have wanted two pairs at the same time. Such was, I have no doubt, the fate of nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand of my ancestors. I have the profoundest respect and admiration for them all, for all, that is to say, except the odd one of the thousand, who was evidently some poor, mean-spirited creature.

War by day and war by night has been incessant for all those millions of generations. What has been the result of that war? The result has been the survival of the fittest, the creation of man, rational man himself. No one in this room would have

been as intelligent as a jelly-fish if it had not been for that warfare, incessantly waged for hundreds of millions of years.

War, stern, ruthless war, war where no quarter is given. War where the weak are exterminated, hideously cruel war. War with no mitigating spark of chivalry—in a word, natural war, which has been essential to the evolution from which man has ascended.

Does anyone think that evolution could have done what it has done without that awful natural warfare? Impossible. Remember Tennyson, who says :

"Tho' Nature red with tooth and claw,
With ravine, shriek'd against his creed."

It is the natural warfare which has raised the species, but the moral sense of civilized man will not now tolerate the natural warfare.

The warfare of civilized man is conducted according to the principles of chivalry. The non-combatants are not to be slaughtered. Their weakness is their protection. Civilized man for his warfare picks out all his strongest and best men, exposes them to all the risks of conflict, while the weaker man is protected. Thus the race is not improved, it is deteriorated by warfare as conducted by civilized man. The conclusion, now, is obvious. By the natural warfare the human race has been created. The chivalrous warfare is conducted on principles quite wrong from the doctrine of the survival of the fittest. If, therefore, civilized man now conducts war it is against nature. The human race must pay the penalty. The moral law forbids us to purchase future improvement of the human race at the appalling price demanded by natural warfare.

With no less force does the polity of nations demand that chivalrous war must cease, as by its means the human race will infallibly deteriorate.

(At this point cries of "Bryan" were heard from all parts of the hall.)

MR. CARNEGIE :

It is not necessary for me to introduce Mr. Bryan to an American audience. He will say a few words to you.

MR. BRYAN :

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am on the program for Wednesday afternoon, and I shall then be able to say what I desire to say to you, therefore I want you to be permitted to listen to some of these distinguished visitors who have come to us from abroad, who have given us the views entertained in their countries. All I want to say to-night before yielding the floor to the gentleman for whom you have shown such partiality, and who is prepared to speak to you again, is this, that it seems we are drawing arguments in favor of peace from every source. We have drawn some to-night from sources that I had not expected. I had hoped we should be able to bring about peace by resting entirely upon the theory that Man is made in the image of his Creator, but I am glad to have peace brought to us even from the theory of man made in the image of the ape. (Applause.)

MR. CARNEGIE :

The Secretary will read to you a few telegrams which he has received from highly important personages, including some of the kings of Europe.

MR. ELY :

I am afraid it would overtax your patience if you were asked to listen to all these messages. Perhaps I may tell you the sources from which some of them come and you may hear them on some other occasion. We heard this evening, a moment or two ago, from one representative of Holland in the person of "Maarten Maartens." We have another message from Holland, the Minister of Foreign Affairs at the Hague giving us his good wishes. From Switzerland we have two messages,—one from the President of the Swiss Federation (applause) and the other from the head of the Permanent International Peace Bureau at Berne. We have from Norway two messages; one from the King of Norway and one from the Nobel Committee of the Norwegian Parliament. We have from Sweden a very cordial letter from the International Parliamentary Group in the National Legislature of Sweden. We have a very kind message from the King of Italy, Victor

Emmanuel. One of the leaders of the Peace movement in Europe, who would have been with us if he could, is Count Apponyi, the head of the Liberal party in Hungary, and he has written us a letter. President Diaz, who is evincing a most earnest interest in this gathering, has been so kind as to send a special message to be presented at the Banquet on Wednesday evening by the Mexican Ambassador, who is also his special representative at the Congress.

There are a great many other messages, with which perhaps your patience ought not to be taxed.

Mr. CARNEGIE :

The Secretary shows his usual good sense ; so, ladies and gentlemen, we will bid you one and all good night.

MRS. MAY WRIGHT SEWALL
MISS JANE ADDAMS
MRS. LUCIA AMES MEAD

FOURTH SESSION
THE RELATION OF WOMEN TO THE
PEACE MOVEMENT

CARNEGIE HALL

Tuesday Morning, April Sixteenth, at 10.30

MRS. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER *Presiding*

MRS. JULIA WARD HOWE, MRS. MAY WRIGHT SEWALL,
Guests of Honor.

MRS. SPENCER:

The Women's Session of the Peace Congress will now open, with the singing of the hymn of invocation, in which I hope the audience, as well as the chorus, will join.

THY KINGDOM COME.

WILLIAM GASKELL.

George Frederick Handel.

O God, the darkness roll away,
Which clouds the human soul,
And let the bright, the perfect day
Speed onward to its goal.

Let every hateful passion die
Which makes of brethren foes;
And war no longer raise its cry,
To mar the world's repose.

Let faith and hope and charity
Go forth through all the earth;
And man, in heavenly bearing, be
True to his heavenly birth.

MRS. SPENCER:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: This meeting is to consider how the great basic institutions of society, of which women are a vital part, stand related to the Peace Movement. We need to

begin all our interpretation of the present with some accurate knowledge of the past,—and our first speaker will give us a brief outline of the history of the Peace Movement. Lucia Ames Mead, of Boston, the Chairman of the Peace Committees of the National Council of Women and National American Women Suffrage Association, and author of the "Peace Primer," and other important literature of the subject, will now address you.

History of the Peace Movement

MRS. LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people who can discern the meaning of the history that is now making. It is that, just as the eighteenth century achieved peace and justice between thirteen states and the nineteenth century extended peace and justice between forty-five states, the twentieth century is to secure peace with justice between all the forty-six nations of the globe. The same principles of organization which created a United States are to create a United World. Internal violence and disorder may endure much longer, but duelling between nations is to cease. Democracy and modern commerce and a growing sense of justice have decreed that submarines and dynamite shall not usurp the place of judge and jury. The movement for international peace is not beginning, but is now approaching its consummation.

Silent forces have been at work ever since the great Dutch statesman, Hugo Grotius, published his "Rights of War and Peace," whilst Bradford and Carver were building their log houses in little Plymouth. Of this book, Andrew D. White has said "of all works not claiming to be inspired, it has proved the greatest blessing to humanity." Time forbids to speak of brave George Fox, who founded the society of Friends,—the oldest peace society in the world;—of his brilliant successor, William Penn, who published a remarkable "plan for the Permanent Peace of Europe"; of Immanuel Kant, a century later, who with philosophic wisdom proclaimed that the world could not have peace until it was organized, and that it could not be safely federated until it had representative government. But in this brief summary, I must confine myself to a fraction of what has happened

since 1815, when David Low Dodge founded the first peace society in the world. He was a noble New York merchant whose posterity unto the third generation have honored this city by their disinterested service. Since that year nearly five hundred peace societies and auxiliary branches have been established in the world, of which the American Peace Society with headquarters in Boston is the oldest in the country, and the New York Peace Society is one of the youngest and most vigorous. The International Peace Bureau is at Berne, Switzerland.

During the first half of the century Noah Worcester, William Ellery Channing, William Ladd, Elihu Burritt and Charles Sumner, and other noble citizens of Massachusetts worked out the scheme for a Permanent International Tribunal which came to be known in Europe as "the American Way." They, like so many pioneers, died ere they saw the realization of their hopes. But they blazed the path which statesmen and captains of industry are entering to-day.

Among the silent forces which have been promoting the rational settlement of international difficulties have been those missionaries of the Most High—democracy, steam and electricity. Within a hundred years the world has shrunk so small that yesterday's doings on five continents are reported every morning at our breakfast table. A century ago a war in Manchuria would not have been known here until four months after it had begun, and would in no way have affected us. To-day commerce has so expanded that every merchant must consider the whole world in estimating his supply and the demand. Investors have become so sensitive that the hysteria in this country twelve years ago over the possibility of war with England about a boundary line in Venezuela cost us \$100,000,000 in foreign investments.

Slowly we are learning that, "in the gain or loss of one race all the rest have equal claim," that as a matter of business we can not allow prospective customers to be beggared by belligerent neighbors or the highways of commerce to be blocked by the shameful legalized piracy that up to date has menaced the peaceful merchantman in war time. Migration, travel, the photograph and school book have modified national prejudice, born of ignorance and isolation. Such a new book as Bridgman's "World Organizations," emancipates the reader from the narrow outlook of the past and opens up a new world of thought.

When Kant declared representative government to be a necessary prerequisite for an organized and peaceful world, no nation in the world had real representation. To-day no nation in Christendom is without some degree of it. Even Russia has its Duma. Outside of Christendom, Japan has a representative Assembly; within six months Persia has gained one, and China is promised one within twelve years. Thus, for the first time in history, world organization is now a possibility.

The first step towards it which commanded the world's attention was the Czar's manifesto of August, 1898. This resulted partly from alarm over the frightful increase of war budgets without any increase in safety, and partly from the profound impression made by the great work on "The Future of War" by the eminent economist and imperial councillor, Jean de Bloch. This demonstrated that under modern conditions war between equally equipped forces was futile and would result simply in bankruptcy if fought to a finish, with victory for neither side. The Czar declared that increase of armaments—the supposed preventive of war—was bringing about "the very cataclysm it was designed to avert." In fact a long armed peace was as great a drain as a brief war. In response to his invitation one hundred delegates from the twenty-six nations that had representatives at St. Petersburg met on May 18, 1899, in "The House in the Wood," at The Hague, and behind locked doors, divided into committees, they worked steadily for three months. At first pessimistic and skeptical, they became inspired with hope through the influence of Lord Pauncefote, Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, Andrew D. White, our minister at Berlin, who headed the American delegation, and a few others, men of faith and vision who knew their subject and did most of the laborious and tactful work. At a critical moment, when Germany's opposition seemed about to frustrate all hope of co-operation, Mr. Holls, an American, was sent by Mr. White to Berlin to see Hohenlohe and Von Bulow. They declared the indifference of the German people in the problem and questioned whether the American people cared much about it. They were amazed to see the multitude of letters and cablegrams from all over the country which he showed as evidence of our concern. Among them was a telegram from thirty-one Baptist clergymen in Oregon, each one of whom had paid a dollar to send it. Another was a prayer, written by a

bishop of Texas, which was to be prayed every Sunday in every church of his diocese. These simple documents had weight. The Germans removed their difficulties and the work went on at The Hague to its brilliant consummation.

As a result of the Conference of 1899, though the limitation of armaments which the Czar desired was postponed, its logical precedent, a Permanent International Tribunal, was established, and in April, 1901, the doors of a fine brick mansion at The Hague, owned by the signatory powers, were opened for the admission of any cases that they chose to bring to this World Court. A little later the generous gift of Mr. Carnegie of \$1,500,000 for a magnificent building and law library for it gave the Tribunal additional prestige. Of its more than seventy judges, from which five are to be chosen for each case, the United States has appointed four, two of whom—Judge Gray and Hon. Oscar Straus—honor this Congress by their participation in it.

Since the Tribunal was opened more than a dozen nations have carried cases there and forty-four treaties between different nations—two by two—have been made to refer cases to it. Holland and Denmark, Chili and Argentina have agreed to arbitrate every case with each other, showing that questions of honor can be arbitrated between nations as well as between individuals. Norway and Sweden in their recent peaceful separation have agreed to refer to the Hague Court any difficulties that may arise claimed by either to be questions of honor.

Moreover, the Hague Conference provided for impartial investigation before declaring war issues in which diplomacy had failed. When the attack by the Russian battleships was made upon the British fishing fleet in the North sea in 1905, and all Great Britain seemed inflamed with a wild demand for vengeance, the whole controversy was quietly transferred to an impartial commission sitting in Paris. This finally decided that the Russians had merely blundered and asked them to pay \$300,000 to the widows and orphans; which they gladly did. Thus was war prevented between Russia and Great Britain. Another provision of that Conference of 1899 was for mediation. This enabled President Roosevelt without danger of being criticised for interference to invite Russia and Japan to end at Portsmouth one of the most terrible wars of modern times.

The International Postal Union with headquarters at Berne,

in Switzerland; the new International Institute of Agriculture with headquarters in Rome; the International Law Association, an outcome of the American Peace Society; the New International Law Quarterly—an outcome of Mr. Smiley's Arbitration Conferences at Mohonk—are only a few of the more important of the hundred international agencies which are promoting such co-operation as the world our fathers knew could never have attained. Especially we note the growth of the Interparliamentary Union, founded by Hon. William Cremer, M. P., one of the winners of the Nobel prize. At its fourteenth session, held in London last summer, this august body, composed of about 2,500 members of the nations' congresses, devoted their whole time to marking out their recommendations for the subjects to be considered at the second Hague Conference, which convenes next June. It is to support their recommendations that this first National American Congress has been called. Since 1899, two new agencies for peace are slowly being recognized as of mighty potency—neutralization of weak peoples like the Filipinos, and the boycott employed upon a recalcitrant nation. Of these there is no time to speak.

The second Hague Conference which this time includes, not merely twenty-six nations, but all of the forty-six nations of the globe, offers the greatest opportunity in human history to lessen the world's poverty and misery. Let every teacher tell her pupils of it. Let every woman who believes in prayer, pray for it. Let every mother, wife and daughter speak words of wisdom about it in their households. Let not the women of America be childish and inert when such stupendous issues hang in the balance.

MRS. SPENCER:

One of our leading sociologists says: "In the individual, the social unit, reside the seeds of health or disease in the social organism; and the home, the family, is the agency by which the individual is socialized." We begin our consideration of women's present relation to the Peace Movement with a discussion of the Home versus War. I have great pleasure in presenting to you, as the speaker for that subject, one who peculiarly represents all that we mean when we speak the words "complete womanhood," Mrs. Ellen M. Henrotin, formerly President of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and now the National President of the Women's Trade Union League.

The Home and the Economic Waste of War

MRS. ELLEN M. HENROTIN.

When in the past a question of international or national adjustment arose it was vain to ask what influence pro or con woman exerted over the decision; for in truth, her voice was unheard—her non-success as a promoter of peace among nations is the best answer to the oft-repeated argument against extending her civil and political influence "that it is woman's indirect influence which counts in political and civil matters." When a war issue is raised the family or economic interests of women or children are, and have always been, completely ignored; though this disregard of home interests is usually disguised to both men and women, by an appeal to love of country, or to express it in the war language, "For home and native land." If by chance women do not respond immediately to so impersonal an issue, when it affects such precious interests, they are cited as poor creatures not worthy of their great opportunities. Woman has in the past accepted this role of passivity, has cherished it, even made a fetich of it; she has concurred with man in the dictum "Might makes right." Thus in those countries where the military form of government prevails it goes without saying, that the part which woman, by her labor, contributes to the fund which makes for civilization, is held in light esteem, though so essential in reality, and that even her "indirect influence" is not acknowledged.

Woman conceives of the ideal man as expressing towards his country physical energy and forceful high spirits; while man conceives of woman towards the same demand as expressing passive endurance—as these two ideals permeate society the influence on the home is so great that in political matters woman has become practically non-expressive; false conceptions of patriotism which pervade all nations have done their part towards rendering her voiceless, while the splendid trappings of war, the rewards meted out to its heroes, in which their women share, have dazzled the eyes and excited the imagination so that it is not surprising that women, as a group, have accepted the rôle of abettor and aider, in so far as a non-combatant possibly could do.

During the Civil War the women on both sides, instead of restraining, urged on the men; in the Austrian-Prussian and

Franco-Prussian wars, the same phenomenon was observed—as it was also in the South African and Russian-Japanese wars—perhaps slightly less in the Spanish-American war. When all the considerations are taken into account which should operate to influence women in favor of peace and arbitration, the attitude towards war which she has taken in the past is difficult to comprehend, for death or inevitable suffering come to those she calls her own as its result, and even her own share is hard to bear, meaning, if she is the mother of a family, the uncertainty of her economic position, being deprived by absence or death of the one who should share the support and care of the children. The contending armies often sweep away her home, which involves the disintegration of its members; or as in Cuba or South Africa as an inmate of a reconcentrado camp, she and her little ones are exposed to privation, disease and death. The suffering of the women and children of Germany, France and the Netherlands, even since the Reformation, are almost beyond belief; thus her acquiescence is one of the most astounding results of the potency of the group opinion and its expression.

It is the more noticeable as woman has had the practical experience of her own rise in the social and industrial world, of her own progress from slavery and wardship to a condition of comparative freedom and the recognition which is slowly but surely being awarded her in the home and in society, all of which has been won by non-resistance. It is the only cause that has progressed without the shedding of blood; all other great reforms have had their battles, as nationality, religion and politics. Human victims have been offered upon all their altars, but woman's progress has been won by almost silent insistence on the value of the peaceful arts and the principles of conciliation, until to-day the entire industrial world is busy supplying her demands.

There are certain tendencies in present-day society that evince the fact that all nations are being aroused to a new conception of their responsibility towards war's waste, and among women it is natural, as it affects the home, and they chiefly are interested, though men and women alike are convinced that war is now too costly a game for nations to play. The self-supporting woman is more impressed by this thought, for she meets the realities of life and thus becomes a judge of relative values; being

obliged to take her part in the competitive struggle for her daily bread, she learns the value of life and work; thus she understands economic waste. When the wage-earning woman marries and becomes a mother, she realizes the economic importance of the life of the husband and father,—as she knows actual conditions she is increasingly unwilling to give up that life to the country; she desires to retain it for the benefit of the family. If the actual facts could be ascertained it would be found that a much smaller percentage of married men enlisted, or offered to enlist, in the late Spanish-American War than did in the Civil War—largely due to the fact of the present changed point of view of women. As opportunities to secure a competency decrease from stress of population or otherwise, this tendency will increase. Perhaps one of the most convincing proofs of the subtle working of this influence was given in England when, after the South African War, the advisability of establishing the conscription was discussed. It was evident at once that the English people would no longer tolerate such a measure.

The education of children in this country has been free from the influence of military training; this is notably true of the spirit of the public school teachings. After each war there inevitably arises a hysterical demand for more military training in public and private schools, but the practical, common sense of an industrial democracy soon asserts itself and the children are, in most instances, left to follow the ways of peace—at least until the boys reach the football age.

Woman is every day learning new methods of expressing herself—either as a member of a group or as an individual; one of the first efforts of her expression of what is to her a new-found truth, is found in the falling birth-rate among those nations which make large demands on the family to maintain standing armies or great armaments. Among those nations, the women best fitted to bear and care for children refuse to bear sons at the call of what has become for them an absolute duty. The claim of the army on family life has seriously affected the birth-rate in France, where the women are notably intelligent and far-sighted observers of economic conditions. The Government has offered prizes for large families, but the French women, with the Napoleonic wars of the past and the large standing army of to-day, will not be tempted by such a bribe. Were the United States to

undertake frequent wars on "punitive expeditions," the same thing would take place in this country, for women are now resolved to have a voice in national discussions which so vitally touch the family life. It is a well-recognized fact, in all countries, that it is increasingly difficult to secure by enlistment men who are equal to the army requirements. In countries where there is no conscription, army men will acknowledge this difficulty, which undoubtedly is to be accounted for by the yet unrecognized, but potent, change in the home point of view towards army life and the soldier's profession.

This sounds in the reading very materialistic, but it is said "that civilization is an economic fact." Certain changes which industrial democracy operates to bring about in the spiritual realm are startling in their expression—it may well be that it will read new meanings into War and Peace.

If War's economic waste is great, what shall be said of its spiritual waste? The writer once heard the late General Walker say that the materialism and commercialism which prevail among men to so great an extent in the United States were, in his opinion, the result of the loss to the country, both in the North and the South, of the "men of the ideal" in our Civil War. Those who for love of home or for freedom's sake went to the front were of the quality of which poets, artists, priests and authors are made—perhaps the Churches have felt their loss more than any other agency which makes for righteousness. It may be that the lack of business ideality, the difficulty of making business dramatic as it were, can also be accounted for by the fact that the excessive demands made on the lives of the men of the ideal, those who were the most capable of putting the human side into business ventures, are gone, leaving the ultra practical man of business in the ascendancy.

The apparent supremacy of American women on the cultured side of life over the men may also be explained, as they, as a group, were not at that time subjected to the same spiritual waste.

The world is always in need of the love and gracious influence of the daughters of men. In a civilization which boasts that woman's influence is all powerful, she cannot raise her voice in the Councils of the Nations to urge moderation, conciliation; she cannot by her vote turn down war as "useless argument," but

she can emphasize the blessing of peace in the home, in society, by expressing her firm conviction that civilization is founded on Peace on Earth, Good-will toward men—and this message she may carry into the marts of trade—into the social world—into the great Congress of Nations.

MRS. SPENCER:

It is fitting, after these noble words, that we should have noble music from the friends who have so kindly come to make more attractive our program—the members of the St. Cecelia Society and the Wednesday Morning Singing Club, under the direction of Mr. Victor Harris.

(Music. "How lovely are the messengers that preach us the gospel of Peace!")

MRS. SPENCER:

The next speaker represents what Emerson said was "woman's organic office in the world,"—education. The school has gone out from the home and has become a separate institution. As it has left the home it has initiated great educational interests on behalf of women, and now we have women's colleges and presidents of women's colleges, and social responsibilities placed heavily upon educated women.

I take great pleasure in introducing to you Miss Mary E. Woolley, President of Mount Holyoke College for women.

The Relation of Educated Women to the Peace Movement

PRESIDENT MARY E. WOOLLEY.

The impressiveness of a gathering like this Peace Congress must be felt by all. It is an inspiration to have a part in a movement which is commanding the attention of the civilized world, to feel the impetus which comes from great assemblies, from wise words and eloquent appeals, from the sense of a common interest which knows no limitation of race or nation. Such occasions are significant in the progress, not only of the movement represented, but of civilization itself, for inspiration is the great motive power of achievement.

Yet it is equally true that such a gathering as New York has seen this week would fail of the highest results were it not followed by continued effort. It is with this thought in mind that I welcome the opportunity to speak to an audience of women, for upon you rests the real burden of this responsibility. The changes have been rung upon the "new woman"; she has been extolled and ridiculed, explained and explained away, but the fact remains that she *does* exist, that the *type* of womanhood to-day is essentially different from that of any other age. The intellectual type is not new; the woman of force, the ruler, the politician, the warrior, the intriguer—the Elizabeths, the Madame de Maintenons, the Boadiceas, the Catherine de Medicis—have been known in other ages. Nor is the emotional type a novelty either in history or fiction. The achievement, the distinction of the representative womanhood of to-day, is that it unites the intellectual and the emotional for some larger social end than the world has ever known before. Her opportunity extends from neighborhood nursing to world organization in the cause of peace. The woman of force now is the woman of the multitude, the woman in industry, in the home, in society. Education has become so general that to be educated no longer places womanhood on a pedestal; it simply broadens horizons and opens eyes to the opportunities of life and the responsibilities which those opportunities bring. The union of the intellectual and the emotional gives to a woman peculiar fitness for work in uplifting humanity. Her response to need is quick, her sympathy keen and her interest personal, and when she adds to these qualities an intelligent understanding of conditions and the power of discrimination she becomes a power in all efforts for the common welfare.

Why should the peace movement make a special appeal to women with their greater interest in matters of common welfare, their new outlook beyond the walls of their own homes and the eager interest which gives a vitality to all their work?

First, because of its practical character. We talk about the mingling of the races and a world unity, and we have only to step from our own doorway to see the possibility made a reality. Jew and Greek, Teuton and Slav, Hindu and Celt, mingle in the current of life on the streets of this city. No country is alien, no race unknown. Naturally, inevitably, there is developing a unity of interests, of customs, of ideas among the representatives

of the most diverse races, and the way is open as never before for presenting the ideal of world unity.

The fundamental principles of the movement enter into the most common experience, for they govern all just and pure living. How can we preach justice to the nations when dealing unjustly with the representatives of those same nations in the tenement districts of our own city; or strive for world unity when busy in erecting barriers between classes? Oppression of a weaker nation, the crushing out of its individuality and the enslavement of its people, is not unlike the industrial oppression which, for the sake of gain, would force little children into the slavery of the cotton mills and men and women into labor which makes of life a mere warfare for existence. On the other hand the attempt to transform a city into a place "where men live a common life for noble ends" is a long step toward world unity.

The task is not a light one, but it can be accomplished if there is developed a keen sense of individual responsibility. Privilege always means responsibility and "noblesse oblige" belongs to the present as truly as to the past. It places upon the womanhood of America the obligation of working in every practical way for the principles for which the peace movement stands; for the rights of the weak, whether they be little children in the factory and women in the sweat-shop, or a defenseless people across the seas; for the recognition of the oneness of the great human family, as real among the classes of New York as among the nations of the world; for the right of the individual as a human being, whether he be an American in Turkey or a Chinaman or Negro in America; for the promotion of justice and arbitration instead of injustice and force, in industrial as well as in international relations.

Secondly, the peace movement makes a strong appeal because of its ideal character. In our exaltation of what is practical, we sometimes overlook the truth that ideals are the condition of all progress and one of the greatest dangers of the present age is the attempt to build a state minus an ideal. It is the duty of education to withstand this drift in the national life and to maintain that the development of the material resources of a country come second to the development of the highest nature of its citizens. In a certain sense every woman is an educator, although the sphere of her work may be more often the home or

society than the school room. It is unnecessary to emphasize to this audience the value of educating the life in the principles on which it should be established. In social work, in religious training, in intellectual culture, this truth is recognized. If we would substitute arbitration for brute force, peace for war, an ideal of world tunity for national and racial antagonisms, the reasonable hope of permanent accomplishment of these ends lies in the education of the children and the youth of to-day, the men and women of to-morrow. "Imitation enters into the very fastnesses of character" and the ideals held before the child determine to a great extent what the man will be. It is because of the strength of this appeal to the imagination that the proposed naval and military display at Jamestown is capable of accomplishing so great harm. If we really wish to develop the spirit of mercy, rather than that of cruelty, to exalt reason rather than violence, why not depict "the enticing splendors of peace" instead of "the enticing splendors of war"?

The peace movement places the emphasis upon the man who can think rather than upon the one who can fight; it would make right stronger than might; subordinate selfish interests to the common good, allay passion, promote self-control and give to individual, nation and race the opportunity to "set the noblest free."

"Prognostics told

Man's near approach; so in man's self arise
August anticipations, symbols, types
Of a dim splendor ever on before
In that eternal circle life pursues.
For men begin to pass their nature's bound
And find new types and cares which fast supplant
Their proper joys and griefs; they grow too great
For narrow creeds of right and wrong, which fade
Before the unmeasured thirst for good; while peace
Rises within them ever more and more."

MRS. SPENCER:

We have already touched upon the great new coming conflict, that which is signalized by "a motion toiling in the gloom, yearning to mix itself with life"; the great movement by which a new industrial order is establishing itself among the

institutions of mankind. One of the best things about the militarism of the old pioneer of civilization was his protection of the women and the children. As a last resort in defending his home, the little ones were placed in the center, the mothers next, and the men outside. We work to-day to carry over into the new industrial order that chivalry of the Age of Militarism. We have not reached it; our children are not protected in the center; they are exploited in industrial places; our women work more hours than their own health and welfare, or the welfare of the next generation justifies, and other monster evils attend our industrial life. Our next speaker will take us still deeper into this great question, the relation of industry to the Peace Movement. She comes here as the representative of the Consumers' League, a movement intended to organize the conscience of the buyer, and make the purchasing public a factor in industrial regeneration—Mrs. Frederick Nathan, President of the New York Consumers' League.

Industry and Its Relation to Peace

MRS. FREDERICK NATHAN.

In primeval days it is possible that the individual savage was wholly independent. It is probable that he was able to procure for himself all his limited requirements. But the earliest savage life of which we have any knowledge reveals to us the fact that even in primitive days men were interdependent, although within narrow group limitations. Gradually the advance of intellect has evolved an industrial interdependence which leads us at the present time to become inhabitants of *the world* in satisfying our wants.

It is a far cry indeed even from the colonial days of our great grandmothers to our present day. Our ancestors very largely produced all that was required for their lives. In their own fields were grown the flax, the hemp, the cotton, which they themselves spun and wove into material which in turn was cut and fashioned by their own hands. In their own gardens grew the vegetables and fruits which they themselves prepared and canned and pickled for their own consumption. The heads of the household often did their own butchering of live stock, while the women members attended to the raising of poultry, the needs of the dairy, the making of raisin wine, of soap, of rope and

twine, of candles for illumination, and of rag carpets for the floor. They even confessed to covering their own furniture.

But when the invention of some cumbersome machinery took all these industries out of the home, work was done under entirely different conditions and all labor has gradually been revolutionized until we find to-day that so specialized has all work become, that even, for instance, in the making of a cotton undergarment, not only are a large number of people utilized, but as many as a half-dozen countries may contribute to its production.

Trade, which in the early days was a mere species of organized piracy, warfare thinly hidden under a milder name, has gradually developed to be a great, if not the greatest agency for peace. The merchant, though perchance unwitting and unwilling, has become the benefactor of the race.

The need for international relationship in commerce and industry, the need for world markets and the interchange of products, has led to the holding of great World's Fairs. These International Industrial Expositions have drawn the Nations together in peaceful rivalry and have shown by object lessons of unexampled power how the work of the world demands peace and fraternity among all mankind.

As commerce and manufacture have become more obviously the leading elements in our civilization, governments have assumed industrial functions. Our consular reports, widely distributed, without cost, upon demand, are filled with matter concerning the various industries of the different countries, and reporting all data of value to our manufacturers and importers.

In former days treaties were drawn up between countries to settle boundary lines, to decide amounts of indemnity to be paid, to bind each other to mutual assistance in the event of war with other nations. They were at best mere armed truces, temporary pauses in perpetual war. But two years ago an epoch-making treaty was drawn up between the delegates representing fourteen European countries, which had for its fundamental basis—not a plan for the exploitation of their citizens, either by taxation for indemnities, or by pledging their men to be used as targets for bullets—but (*mirabile dictu*) a plan to protect their citizens by mutually agreeing to prohibit the work of women in factories at night. This sprang from a similar narrower movement of the year before, when the governments of France and Italy arranged

the earliest labor treaty, providing for factory inspection, abolition of night work for women, reduction of hours for women, a day of rest once a week, and granting to French and Italian co-laborers in both countries equal treatment in respect to payment of pensions, and sick and accident benefits.

Yet another European treaty has recently been made, one more remarkable still in its high moral purpose. It aims to place industrial competition on a higher level; it forbids,—getting down to practical detail—forbids the use of white or yellow phosphorus in match-making. The fumes of this phosphorus are specially dangerous to the working men and women employed in the manufacture of matches, and various governments had long wished to forbid its use, but were met by the manufacturers' cry that their competitor in other lands used it and would undersell them. So matches intended to enlighten the world were made in the darkness of cruelty, and inhumanity. Now at last seven nations have combined, and it seems we are to have truly enlightened matches.

Verily may we feel that we have at last begun to enter upon a new era, prophesied by Jane Addams in her new book, "The Newer Ideals of Peace," the triumph of industrialism over militarism. In these treaties the representatives of Great Britain and Continental Europe aimed to "protect their civic resources," to nurture the real wealth of their nations, the health of their peoples. Strange to say, our country, which is supposed to stand for the highest ideals of democracy, is far behind these European governments in this respect.

Only recently three of the five judges of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of this city rendered a majority decision to the effect that our state law, which had been enacted about ten years ago, prohibiting night work for women, was unconstitutional. The fact that fourteen other nations have found it practicable and expedient to pledge themselves to refrain from working their women at night, should have at least a moral effect upon our nation and the highest court may reverse this decision.

Not only have governments united in passing laws for the protection of their working people and in the interest of humane industry and enlightened commerce, but the general public has become awakened to its responsibilities as *consumers*, and has organized the conscience and intelligence of the buyer as a means

of social progress. This is a movement toward universal peace and international fraternity.

To-day conscientious consumers who wish to know under what conditions the articles which they consume are made, consumers who realize that their demands create the supply and therefore desire to inform themselves intelligently in regard to the sources of supply, are made aware of the fact that the boundary line of their investigations is measured only by the boundaries of the civilized globe. For example, in the case of the cotton undergarment, the cotton may have been grown in Alabama, where child labor is not restricted, and is even authorized at night, it may have been spun and woven by machines attended by little children under the tender age of ten. This machinery may have been made in England and its transportation here have necessitated the utilization of ships and ship provisions from countless evil sources. Or the raw cotton may itself have been transported to England for manufacture. Or again the goods may have been bleached in the District of Columbia, where there are no laws prohibiting child labor, and the garment having been cut in a factory, may have been stitched in some wretched germ-infected sweat-shop in our own city. The coal for all this factory work may have been procured from Pennsylvania mines where hundreds of little boys work in the breakers. As for the trimming on the garment, the embroidery may have been worked by hand in Switzerland or France, at starvation rates, in a prison or in a convent, or else it may have been made by machinery in Germany. The lace may have been made under the most trying conditions in Belgium, France or Italy; the pearl buttons may have been manufactured in Austria, and the material for them have been procured from the Persian Gulf or the Red Sea. The garment may have been laundered in some Chinese laundry, where the soap used had been made in a Chicago beef-packer's factory, and finally the garment reaches the consumer through the wholesale merchant, who sells it to the retail merchant, who may underpay and overwork the saleswoman who effects the final sale.

Women constitute a very large percentage of the purchasing public. As the years go by (no doubt owing to the propaganda of the Consumers' League), an increasingly large number of women show a desire to acquire their purchases with such peace of conscience as is assured them by the treaty which prohibits

night work for women. Instead of making individual efforts to discriminate in favor of goods free from the taint of cruelty involved in night work, their consciences are freed, once for all, by that treaty as to *all* goods from *all* the countries bound by it. Would that similar treaties were enacted extending the exemption from night work to young boys! That treaty is the stepping-stone which must necessarily lead to further industrial gains, to be accomplished by the same enlightened method, which makes for International Peace.

The industries of the different nations are their mainstay, and carry wealth to their centers, and are like the arteries in our bodies, carrying blood to the heart, the constant action of which renews our vitality. To these facts mankind is at last awakening. War is becoming too businesslike for a business generation. It costs too much,—costs not only to the conquered, but to the conqueror. In destroying his enemies, he destroys at least in part the source of his own wealth. Hence the necessities of industry work eternally for peace.

Realizing that we have thus reached a point far beyond tribal isolation and that we must in future recognize our international commercial bonds, an International Conference has been arranged, to be held next July in Switzerland, to be attended by delegates from the various European Consumers' Leagues, for the exchange of ideas and experiences relating to the different standards of production and distribution in different countries. The aim is eventually to establish an international standard of the ethics of labor.

The feeling of universal brotherhood has already been aided by this international movement, aided more perhaps than most of us realize. Women can indeed be proud of the fact that largely through their efforts this Consumers' League movement has been organized and fostered.

Although women are rarely given a voice in the matter of deciding whether war shall be proclaimed or not, the maintenance of the family falls largely upon the women in times of war. Women suffer in war as well as in peace, for that matter, from the reduction in wages and the increased taxes, due to the cost of armies and navies.

From 1897 to 1904 the United States spent \$307,000,000 for military purposes. An expenditure of \$200,000,000 is now con-

sidered "normal," so great has been the increase during the last few years. Yet when a bill was recently passed by Congress providing for the investigation of conditions of industry under which women and children in our country work, the clause providing for an appropriation for the task was deliberately stricken out, thus making the entire bill practically worthless.

Hence it seems that our land has fallen behind in the advance toward industrial harmony, and industrial prosperity and harmony are the mightiest impulses making for perpetual peace. This country, which planned the first International Peace Congress, and which led the world in organized work for peace, has left to other hands the consummation of the work. Can we not return to our place in the forefront of the mighty struggle—the great War for Peace!

MRS. SPENCER: An object of most intense interest is a noble personality embodying a great ideal. I have only this word in introduction of our next speaker, Miss Jane Addams, head of Hull House, Chicago.

New Ideals of Peace

MISS JANE ADDAMS.

We sometimes forget when we belittle war and its glittering paraphernalia that after all it represents a series of ideas and emotions which have been very dear to men from the beginning of time. In the same way that the historic church, striving in vain to express in solid form the noblest aspirations of the human heart, has called to her aid music, the cathedral, the procession, the ecclesiastical vestment,—so War, desiring to impress the human mind with the courage of the soldier, his readiness to die, his willingness to surrender all to patriotism, has called to its aid music, the march and the gold-bedecked uniform. All through the centuries whether men were driven in tribes by the pangs of hunger to find land and food outside of their own territory, or whether they were impelled by the dynastic ambition of their rulers, by religious enthusiasm or by imperial vanity they have clothed warfare in high-sounding language and it has always had behind it noble emotions and fine endeavor at least on the part of the men actually engaged in it.

If we would for a moment dream that we may abolish war by supplementing these historic emotions by others more beneficent, by turning into newer channels the waters which have flowed so long in these heroic ways, then we must put ourselves to it to discover and substitute ideas, to let loose other emotions, to find incentives which shall seem as strenuous, as heroic, as noble and as well worth while as those which have sustained this long struggle of warfare.

Living as we do in an industrial age, it would seem reasonable to look for these substitutes first in the long history of industrial progress. A rapid historic review makes it quite clear that when human life was still in the tribal stage the men of the tribe went forth in numbers in order to secure the raw material for food and shelter and they brought the trophy of the chase back into the tribe, that the women there might transform it into available form; the flesh of the wild creature into proper food and the pelt into clothing. In this early life women performed as positive a service as men did, but owing to a difference in kind, women were trained in patience and endurance, men in heroic and sudden action. Woman's part in this life, broadly speaking, was industrial, as man's was military, but the distinction was made more marked by the fact that the industrial activity was performed more and more in family isolation, while men who went forth to hunt, to pillage and to fight, found their success ever more dependent upon numbers. Men thus early learned to act together, to incite themselves by war cries or by the calls of the chase, to lean upon each other for defense and achievement. While women only occasionally came together in a mutual task, men were constantly driven into an inter-relation and quite naturally and inevitably they developed the beginnings of the army. Finally its very size became an exhilaration, the bigger the army the more sure they were that their cause was just and victory secure.

This broad division between the work of women and men has held throughout the centuries, women's work tending to center in the home, and man's work, even after he organized industry and commerce, still being carried on in groups. Although man pits one group against another in this later organization, and the spirit of competition is but the thinly-disguised spirit

of war, he still clings to the army, for it represents to him at once his most primitive and most stirring life.

But during the past one hundred years woman's traditional activity has changed its form and her family isolation has been rudely broken in upon. Her historic activities are carried on in great factories, so that if women would continue their old business of turning raw material into food for human consumption, and fashioning fibers and wool into garments, it must be done in inter-relation with hundreds of other people. If women would perform their tasks as efficiently under the factory system of industry as they did formerly under the domestic system of industry they must learn to work in large groups as they learned formerly to work in family isolation.

I think it was Ruskin who used to say that if the first cannon which was fired in the next British war should demolish all the china in every English woman's china-closet, England would never have another war. Let us say that if the first cannon to be fired in the next war should bring to the heart of every woman throughout the two nations involved, the consciousness that it was going to kill thousands of little children either because they were to be deprived of their fathers and of their homes, as they have been in South Africa, or for a dozen other causes, there would not be another war. Of course if women visualized the results of war as they might visualize the destruction of china, there would not be another war. We fail to bring about the end of war simply because our imaginations are feeble. They are so inadequate that they lag behind even the industrial organization of the moment. The poets and the musicians who might help us by an inspirational interpretation of industry also fail us and we do not rise to the occasion which the organization of industry at the present moment offers to women. For the first time in the history of the world women have the opportunity of carrying on their legitimate work in groups and definite inter-relations, not only with each other but with all society. What might not happen if women realized that the ancient family affection, that desire to protect and rear little children which they have expressed so long in isolation, might now be socialized and be brought to bear as a moral force on the current industrial organization. Personally I do not believe that the glamour of war will ever pass to the side of construction and conservation, that it will ever be

possible to make industry seem as heroic as war has seemed unless we can do something of this sort. Why do we not do it? Do the habits of isolation still cling to women? Do women fail to move forward together because they have lacked the training in comradeship and forward march that the army has afforded to men, or because they have failed to consider these deeper things of life in their social aspects? It may be that they are still content, as they have always been, to look at life from the purely domestic point of view and when industry has changed from the domestic system to the factory system that they are morally totally unprepared to make the corresponding social advance.

Mrs. Nathan has referred to a conference of diplomatic representatives held in Berné last September when fourteen nations agreed that within their borders women should not be permitted to engage in manufacture during the night hours. These diplomatic representatives on that occasion at least dropped the affairs of warfare and statecraft and considered the affairs of industry in their international relation. In doing this they entered into the realm which has traditionally and historically belonged to women. They contended that the health of women gave way under night work, that if long continued it was certain to interfere with their maternal duties and with the vigor of their children, and they were considering the human side of industry when they contemplated the loss to the nation in the sacrifice of child life and of normal domesticity. But although those subjects have always been the concern of women, it is quite safe to assert that women had little part in the calling of this conference, or in carrying it forward. The affairs of the industrial world are largely outside of woman's interest and knowledge, and yet we know that these great industrial processes will not go on properly if they are unregulated and uncared for, that women in failing to ameliorate them, to guide them, to do the things which they have always done are failing simply because industry has suddenly taken a large form. It is no longer domestic, but has become collective. Because we are dull and untaught we are failing to bring into industry that concern for the weak which may express itself through sacrifice and courage, that defense and comradeship which might unite groups of workers into spiritual bonds and lift up industrial progress into a tremendous national

motive for work and efficiency. When structural iron workers build a bridge, almost exactly the same percentage of them are wounded and killed as of men who engage in battle, but as yet we utterly fail to regard them as an example of industrial heroism, and they fall not as heroes, but as victims.

When men and women meet together to consider seriously what may be done to advance the cause of Peace one longs to make this suggestion, that we pour into industry something of that comradeship which has so long belonged to war, something of that glamour which Tolstoy declares adheres in the drum itself, so that when men hear a certain beat they leave everything to follow the call. Cannot we formulate a call for industrial service? Cannot we predict that woman's traditional work will go forward worthy of its domestic beginnings, that the wolfish eagerness of the chase and of the battlefield shall be mitigated by the defence of the weak and the education of the young? War, the old enemy of industry and of the home, many of us believe is passing out of society. It may leave us sordid and materialistic or its passing may prove the challenge to a finer and more humane endeavor than war could possibly arouse.

MRS. SPENCER:

Sir Edgar Elgar, the eminent musical composer of London, was to have been with us this morning, but unfortunately is prevented by illness. We have just heard one of his beautiful compositions, and therefore feel that he is represented, as an artist prefers to be, by his work.

Mr. William Archer, the dramatic critic of the *London Tribune*, is with us and will presently address us, and I want to say that although this may be called a women's meeting, men are in sympathy and present with us. The gavel that I was allowed to use in calling the meeting to order, was handed to me by Mr. Powderly, in testimony that organized labor welcomed women's work for Peace; and other organizations of men have shown courtesy. I take great pleasure in introducing Mr. Archer, the distinguished dramatic critic.

The Flag of Peace

WILLIAM ARCHER.

MADAM PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The short paper which I propose to read to you, and which I wish I could

deliver without reading, is called "The Flag of Peace," a plea for the United States of Europe, and I think you will find that the admirable address of Miss Jane Addams formed a prelude to my remarks, in so far as she seems to believe that Peace should not leave entirely to war the spectacular element, but that we should try to employ the spectacular element on the side of Peace. That is also the keynote of the thought I have now to present to you.

There is nothing new in the idea that the United States of America ought to serve as a model, or rehearsal, for the United States of Europe. I myself expressed it seven or eight years ago, in a little book upon America; and though I do not know that I actually borrowed or stole it from anyone, I was certainly not the first to hit upon so obvious a thought. A recently published extract from a commonplace book of Henrik Ibsen's shows that the essence of the idea was present to his mind at some time anterior to the unification of Germany in 1870. He says: "We laugh at the four-and-thirty fatherlands of Germany; but the four-and-thirty fatherlands of Europe are equally ridiculous. North America is content with one, or—for the present—with two." I am far, then, from imagining that this thought, in itself, will have any novelty for you. What I wish to do is to suggest a practical affirmation and application of the idea, which may have occurred to others, but has certainly not yet been put in practice.

My thought is briefly: "Why should Europe wait? There are unquestionably, in every country of Europe, thousands of men and women who, though they may be ardent lovers of their native land, have eliminated from their patriotism the taint of international envy, jealousy and rancor. These people are already, in spirit, citizens of the United States of Europe: why should they not formulate and assert that citizenship? Why should they not make, to-day or to-morrow, their Declaration of Independence from historic hatreds and racial antagonisms? In short, why should not we, who are of this way of thinking, forthwith establish the United States of Europe, hoist and salute the Union flag, and consciously and deliberately proceed to live in that Union, to realize it in our thoughts, to consolidate it in our endeavors, to sanctify it in our sentiments and affections?" That is the question I wish ultimately to put to you; and when I have

more fully explained its implications, I hope you will answer with me, "Why not?"

Perhaps I may best illustrate the idea by telling you how it came to me. I was reading "The Future in America," by Mr. H. G. Wells. And here, in parenthesis, let me record my belief that, with some scattered flaws, that is a wise and good book, worthy of very careful attention on this side of the Atlantic. The point is immaterial to my present purpose; but as Mr. Wells gave the immediate impulse to the idea I am trying to express, I should hold it ungrateful not to bear witness in passing to the esteem in which I hold that humane and stimulating thinker.

Mr. Wells relates how he was taken by "a pleasant young lady of New York, who seems to find sustaining happiness in Settlement work on the East Side," to see American citizens in the making at the Central School of the Educational Alliance in East Broadway. He proceeds:

"It's a thing I am glad not to have missed. I recall a large, cool room with a sloping floor, rising tier above tier of seats and desks, and a big class of bright-eyed Jewish children, boys and girls, each waving two little American flags to the measure of the song they sang.

"'God bless our native land' they sang—with a considerable variety of accent and distinctness, but with a very real emotion.

"Some of them had been in America a month, some much longer, and here they were—being Americanized. They sang of America—'sweet land of liberty'—they drilled with the little bright, pretty flags, swish they crossed and swish they waved back, a waving froth it was of flags and flushed children's faces; and then they stood up and repeated the oath of allegiance, and at the end filed tramping by me and out of the hall."

"'It is touching,' whispered my guide. 'I told her it was the most touching thing I had seen in America.'

"And so it remains."

"Think of the immense promise in it! Think of the flowers of belief and effort that may spring from this warm sowing!"

Here, then, I dropped the book and *did* think. I thought of the Stars and Stripes waved by millions of childish hands from Maine to New Mexico, from the Florida Keys to Puget Sound; and I thought how the sentiment of affection, of devotion, thus engendered and fostered, was the true cement, the inde-

structible and ever-renewed force of cohesion, holding together these vast and varied territories which we call the United States. You have here greater distances than those which separate the remotest corners of Europe. You have all sorts of physical and climatic differences, begetting differences of temperament, of manners, of material interests. You have such a medley of races as has never before been included in one commonwealth, save, perhaps, the Roman Empire. You have, in short, many principles of disunion, of dissension, of strife; while you have not, as in the Roman Empire as aforesaid, as in the Russian Empire, as in the British Empire of India, any potent military organization creating a sort of mechanical and superimposed unity. What have you in place of this external bond which constituted *Pax Romana*, and constitutes, so far as India is concerned, the *Pax Britannica*? You have simply the sentiment of devotion to the national flag—or rather, I may say, in the best and noblest sense, to the Imperial flag. For the greatest Republic on earth may quite as justly be called the greatest Empire on earth—the greatest aggregate of sovereign and self-governing States, bound together by a sentiment, an ideal, which merges all differences of local ideal, sentiment and interest, and makes the very thought of internecine war a monstrosity and a horror. That ideal, that emotion, symbolized in your beautiful stars and stripes, is the great asset of the American citizen—a material as well as a spiritual asset, since it means his exemption from the major part of the ever-growing burdens imposed on us Europeans by our suspicions and fears of our next-door neighbors. So long as other quarters of the world are still prompt to resort to the stupid arbitrament of blood-stained iron, it behooves the Republic to be prepared for self-defense, and for her share in the policing of the world. But the United States, in itself, is untouched by the international rancors, jealousies and cupidities which keep Europe under arms. It is conceivable, indeed, that the problem of the distribution of wealth, so urgent on both sides of the Atlantic, may, on either side, lead to bloodshed; but that is a wholly different matter from the strife of nation against nation to which we are hourly exposed in Europe. It is what the insurance companies would call another order of risk, which we may eliminate from our present problem. And why have you not, over this vast continent, nation glaring at nation, with half-

timorous, half-murderous and wholly evil eyes, across here a river, there a mountain range, or perhaps across some even less tangible barrier, which is the mere symbol of "old, unhappy, far-off things and rancors long ago?" Why, because you have, from the very first moments of your national history, wisely, sedulously and heroically maintained and cultivated that intense emotion regarding your national unity, and its symbol in red, white and blue, which Mr. Wells saw already implanted in those alien children whom your hospitable—perhaps too hospitable—empire had taken to her bosom. I say that Mr. Wells would have been not only a very stupid Englishman, but a bad citizen of the world, had he witnessed that spectacle without emotion; and I think no good citizen of the world can possibly fail to share the emotion which thrilled him.

And now I come to what is perhaps a ticklish point in my argument. You may have noticed how I said that you had "heroically" maintained the sentiment of national unity. That was an allusion, of course, to the fact that your unity had been preserved at the cost of the most terrible civil war recorded in history. Here, then, the scoffer may not unnaturally say: "Why vaunt the efficacy as a peace preserver of a sentiment which has failed to prevent, within the past half-century, a war at least as destructive as any of those which have arisen from the international rancors and cupidities which it is supposed to obviate? Ladies and gentlemen, I will answer this objection, perhaps paradoxically, by saying that it ought to have been more strongly put. Not only did the sentiment of unity not prevent the great Civil War; it was at bottom the motive and source of that gigantic struggle. The question of slavery was doubtless that which precipitated the war; but the real question at issue was the principle of unity against duality, or rather multiplicity. Once admit the right of secession, and every State or group of States which felt its immediate interests divergent from those of its neighbors would have broken away, marked out its frontier line with forts and custom houses, and proceeded to glare across the said frontier in that overburdened, overwrought, nerve-straining condition of suspended belligerency which we, in Europe, miscall Peace. The strong sense of the Northern States instinctively realized that to suffer this condition of things to arise would be to throw away the one unique and inestimable advantage which history and

geography had conspired to bestow upon the American people. They felt that at all hazards this "flying in the face of Providence" must be prevented; and they heroically paid the price of its prevention. I am not afraid to confess that, in point of what may be called abstract legality, I think the South had at least as strong a case as the North; and I am full of admiration for its pathetic clinging to its not ignoble ideals. But the ideals of the South were allied to the past, the ideals of the North were in league with the future. Therefore I read with peculiar emotion the history of that battle of the giants; for I feel it to have been, in very truth, a war for peace and a victory for peace. Terrible as was the price paid, I think it was well paid, and paid once for all.

However much we may deplore the fact that the ideal of the Union had thus to be baptized in blood and tears, it would be folly, I think, not to recognize that this baptism has given a peculiar sanctity, among all the flags of the world, to the Stars and Stripes. It is a sanctity which may be profaned by thoughtless and boastful flag-flaunting—or in other words by a spirit of what we in England call *Jingoism*. But in its ideal, and in a great many of its actual manifestations, the sentiment with which Americans regard their national flag is a noble and beautiful thing, and full of hope, as I now proceed to suggest, not for the United States alone, but for the whole world. Such a sanctity as attaches to your flag cannot be created by an act of will, or in a moment of time. But there must be a beginning to everything. The Stars and Stripes themselves were once—and not so many generations ago—a new, an unfamiliar, a provisional, a questionable thing. What I want to ask is why the United States of Europe should not even now have their own Union flag, and cultivate in all generous and forward-reaching souls—in all souls that are young, whatever be the age of their physical integument—an enthusiastic and lyrical sentiment towards it, such as that which Mr. Wells saw growing in the breasts of the new-made American citizens down in East Broadway.

A flag, ladies and gentlemen, is a very beautiful thing, a thing of spirit-stirring appeal. It has color, it has movement, it has life. It floats in the clear air above like a silent watchword of inspiration, leading our eyes and thoughts upward, far above the petty passions and distractions of the common day. I think

the Stars and Stripes the most inspiring flag in the world, because it is peculiarly the flag of Peace; but far be it from me to deny or dissemble the emotion awakened in me by my own flag, the flag of England,

The flag that's braved a thousand years
The battle and the breeze,

and that now floats over so many great and free communities. It is true that in bygone centuries, in Europe and even in America, the appeal of the flag has been largely a warlike one, has been intimately associated with bellicose and aggressive passions. But there is no inherent reason why it should be so; and I think we, in Europe, might well inaugurate this, our new century, by hoisting a new flag, the banner of the United States of Europe, which should be distinctively and characteristically, the Flag of Peace, and should symbolize our hope, or rather our faith, in a new era of humanity and reason, not so very far off. Such a flag would provide a rallying-point for all who share that faith, or even that hope—for all, in short, whose will is a will for Peace. It would be associated with no religious creed, with no political party. Christian and Pagan, Catholic and Protestant, Conservative and Radical, Individualist and Socialist, could alike gather round it, and find, in the circle of its influence, a common standing-ground, perhaps even a common *understanding* ground. It could fly side by side with any national flag, for it would imply no sort of disloyalty to that symbol—only the cancelling, in its connotation, of the element of hatred, malice and uncharitableness. It would, in a word, give visible and inspiring expression to the sentiment which animates us here, and which animates thousands of men and women in all parts of the world. It would, no doubt, meet with some derision at first, both from the thoughtless mob and from the cynical and shallow theorist who cannot believe that reason will ever come to its rights, or that the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns. But what matters a little derision? A sentiment of zeal and devotion would soon grow up around the Flag of Peace among all who have “free souls”; and, as the passage from Mr. Wells so vividly suggests, that sentiment might be infused from their earliest years into the blood and nerves of the rising generation. Wherever two or three were gathered together in the name of peace—whether in a

Julia Ward Howe.

Lady who lovest and who livest Peace,
And yet didst write Earth's noblest battle song
At Freedom's bidding—may thy fame increase
Till dawns the warless age for which we long!

—*Frederick Lawrence Knowles.*

palace at The Hague or in a country meeting house, or in a schoolroom in the slums—there the Flag of Peace should be displayed, the emblem of the United States of Europe.

I am no artist, ladies and gentlemen, nor have I had time to take counsel with designers. But I suggest that, in the form of the flag, the analogy with the Stars and Stripes should be emphasized. The star, as it is the most wonderful of all visible things, is the most beautiful of all symbols; and I have floating in my mind a vision of a Star of Stars—a star-cluster grouped so as to form a single star—which I think might perhaps serve the purpose. To that Star we and our children might quickly learn to look up with pride, with hope, with reverence. Under the guidance of that star we should march forward to a new world, freed from the awful burden, the pitiful stupidity of war; for it would indeed be a star of sweet influence, radiating, in very truth, the spirit of peace on earth and good-will towards men.

MRS. SPENCER:

I hold in my hand two telegrams peculiarly appropriate to our English guests, and to our meeting this morning. The Daughters of the American Revolution telegraph their sympathy with the Peace Congress, testifying that out of that which is divided comes that which is united; also the Daughters of the Confederacy send us a cordial greeting in token that our country is really one. On this platform sit representatives of North Carolina and Massachusetts, Alabama and Maine, California and Texas, and many other States of the North and South, all united in this cause. We are one, and those who laid down their lives on either side, did it, as Mr. Archer has said, in sacredness of consecration, some perhaps not understanding what they did, and none recognizing that which was to come.

(Music.)

MRS. SPENCER:

Julia Ward Howe, one of our guests of honor, has a greeting for this meeting. Owing to her advanced years her family were not willing that she should take the long journey, therefore she could not be present, but she sends her daughter, Mrs. Florence Howe Hall, to read to you her message.

MRS. FLORENCE HOWE HALL:

The catastrophe of the Franco-Prussian war in 1870 and the subsequent spoliation of France by victorious Germans,

awoke in the minds of many women a sense of the uselessness and horror of war. To me came one day the thought that women alone know the cost of human life, since it is always purchased by their pain, often attended with danger, and even with the loss of life. Women, then, it seemed to me, ought to have the casting vote in the disposition of a value so dearly purchased, and always at their expense. This last familiar fact now appealed to me with a force never felt before. I cried aloud: "If the women of the world would unite their efforts to prevent resort to arms, no more blood would be shed upon the battlefield." I felt this so strongly that it seemed as though I had only to express my conviction to rally around me all the mothers of mankind, and to this end I determined to devote immediate and unremitting labor. My first act was to write and publish an "Appeal to Womanhood Throughout the World." Through the kindness of friends, this brief document was translated into most of the tongues of modern Europe and circulated as widely as circumstances would allow.

I next bethought me of gathering together the men and women in my own country who had already shown some interest in the cause of peace. Many of these were among the Friends, but the movement had extended beyond their bounds. I held long meetings in New York and in Boston. In the city first named, the eminent jurist, David Dudley Field, gave me his aid at my first meeting, while the venerable poet, Bryant, spoke for me on a later occasion.

It soon occurred to me that one day in every year might be put apart for especial efforts in this cause. I chose for this the second day of June, a time of the year in which open-air meetings could easily be held, and in which the adornment of flowers was easily obtainable. I gave to this festival the name of "Mothers' Day," because my new departure rested so much, in my mind, upon the sacred claim of mothers upon the lives which they had given. The Universal Peace Society of Philadelphia kindly welcomed the institution of Mothers' Day, which was to be observed with floral decorations and appropriate exercises. For some years the day was observed in Boston, with lovely music and earnest speech and argument. In 1872, I went to England, where I at once sought the advice of Mrs. Josephine L. Butler. She said: "You have come at a fortunate time. The

Government ordinances regarding the barrack life of the military have awakened much opposition, as tending to break up family life for the soldiers, and thus to introduce an element of demoralization." Mrs. Butler gave me much helpful advice, and some helpful introductions. Through her aid I visited a number of the leading cities of England, holding in these places meetings which were numerous attended, and at which the magistrates of the town sometimes presided. In London I hired a hall in the well-known Free Masons Tavern for a number of Sundays, advertising a meeting at which I was the only speaker. The attendance on these occasions was larger than I had dared to hope. I received also much personal kindness among my new friends. I may mention Professor Seeley, author of "Ecce Homo," Sir John Bowring, poet and publicist, and the sisters and brother of John Bright.

A well-attended meeting at Willis' rooms closed my efforts in London.

A flying visit to Paris gave me the opportunity of introducing my theme at a public convention, and when I returned to my own country I felt that I had done all that I was capable of doing in behalf of a Women's Peace Movement.

What has made the difference between that time and this? Two things, chiefly, as far as women are concerned. These are the higher education now conceded to them, and the discipline of associated action with which recent years have made them familiar. Who shall say how great an element of progress has unfolded itself in this last clause? Who shall say what pettiness of personal ambition has become merged in the higher ideal of service to the state and the world? The noble army of women which I saw as in a dream, and to which I made my appeal, has now come into being. The mothers have a voice in the councils of the nations. On the wide field where the world's greatest citizens band together to uphold the highest interests of society women of the same type employ their gifts and graces to the same end. Oh, happy change! Oh, glorious metamorphosis! In less than half a century the conscience of mankind has made its greatest stride toward the control of human affairs. The Women's Colleges and the Women's Clubs have had everything to do with the great advance which we see in the moral efficiency

of our sex. These two agencies have been derided and decried, but they have done their work.

If a word of elderly counsel may become me at this moment, let me say to the women here assembled: "Do not let us go back from what we have gained. Let us, on the contrary, ever press forward in the light of the new knowledge, of the new experience. If we have rocked the cradle, have soothed the slumber of mankind, let us be on hand at their great awakening, to make steadfast the peace of the world."

MRS. SPENCER:

Our other guest of honor is here; she was not invited because age and feebleness had retired her from active conflict, but for exactly the opposite reason that she is still in the field, the active chairman of the Committee on Peace of the International Council of Women, a body including in its membership the National Councils of Women of nineteen of the enlightened nations of the world. We have not used the time of this morning for the presentation of the work of women's organizations, but inasmuch as the International Council of Women holds a unique and commanding position in respect to the Peace Movement, we have asked our honored guest, Mrs. May Wright Sewall, to present a printed summary of the work of the Women's Councils in behalf of Peace and Arbitration, copies of which are distributed throughout the audience. In addition Mrs. Sewall will now give you very briefly the closing word of this session.

The International Council of Women

MRS. MAY WRIGHT SEWALL

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, AND DELEGATES: You who are my auditors, realize that between the other honored guest and myself, measured by time, there lies a generation, measured by service much more than a generation. It is, indeed, Mrs. Spencer, an honor to have been invited here as the guest of this great Congress, but, Oh! I felt it was not an honor when the price was my silence before this vast assembly. I have the honor to bring to this congress the great interest of the International Council of Women, which I think will be introduced to you more specifically than it has ever been before, if you will

kindly read the pamphlet which has been printed by this Congress for your instruction concerning it. Now, it is from twenty-three National Councils, Madam President, containing within that membership seven and one-quarter millions of women, that I bring greetings. Could I hope to speak for such a vast multitude in three minutes, Madam President? No, not in three hours.

Organized in 1888, the National Council of Women of the United States committed itself unanimously to active work for the promotion of Peace and International Arbitration as the one great moral cause in which women of all classes and all organizations could unite their efforts. This National Council welcomed the establishment of the Hague Tribunal in 1899 by appropriate resolutions forwarded to the Czar of Russia through the courtesy of the State Department and by the approval of President McKinley. It has celebrated the establishment of the Hague Court each 18th of May by holding Peace Demonstrations. It has enlisted the interest and aid of clergymen, lawyers, the press, important organizations and leading individuals in all walks of life in the preparation for and the programs and reports of these meetings. Over 1,400 such Peace and Arbitration meetings held in six consecutive years, and in every State of our Union, except Florida, Mississippi and Alabama, attest the deep and widespread interest in this cause on the part of the women of America.

The International Council of Women received in 1897 from Lady Aberdeen, then its President, a communication urging that "great prominence" should be given in the organization to the subject of "International Arbitration." At the second quinquennial of this International Council this subject was made conspicuous through the holding of a great public meeting, addressed by representatives of all the National Councils then affiliated. At this meeting the following resolution was introduced by Mrs. Byles, acting as the representative of Baroness Von Suttner, and seconded by Frau Salenka, who had initiated the demonstration meetings in support of the Hague Convention:

Resolved, That the International Council of Women take steps in every country to further and advance by every means in its power the movement toward International Arbitration.

This resolution, unanimously passed, committed this great body of women to Peace as its first, and for five years its only propaganda; and the first Standing Committee was constituted to promote this great interest. Since 1899, therefore, the International Council of Women has stood ready to be used for the noble purposes of the promotion of social Peace, the reduction of armaments, the substitution of an International Tribunal of Justice for warfare, and the establishment of a permanent International Parliament which shall legislate for the world, as the congress or parliament of each of its constituent parts legislates for a single nation.

But I must express my conviction that what has been said this morning in all of these splendid messages, is after all only an indication of a means to an end,—the International Parliament,—which shall ultimately sit to legislate for the nations of the world. It is after all but a means, an agency, as the International Court of Arbitration is but a means, so I shall hurriedly pass the means and try to propound the end to our International Council, the end that looks for this result, not for the abatement of war, but for its extinction (applause); not to the limitation of armaments but the remanding of the war ships into the museums of history, where it will require as much patience and skill to reconstruct their forms and rehabilitate them as it now requires scientific skill to reproduce the form of the mastodon.

Our result, our ultimate object, is the cessation of all warfare by the extinction of all competition, by the supplanting of competition by co-operation (applause), by the displacement of hate, all international hate and international envy, by international affection. That is indeed no sentimental ground, Madam President, it had its origin in our creation, born out of the heart of God. This humanity, which the conflict of its development upon this plane has divided into so many races, but which its evolution into the likeness of its father shall unite,—a United States of Europe, Mr. Archer says. Long ago the International Council announced the United States of the World. These United States of the World must include all the countries of the world, from the Western Hemisphere where the sun sets, onward to the Orient where the sun rises,—where it still rises obscured not by any abatement of its power of enlightenment, but only obscured by the narrow limitations of national patriot-

ism of nations, only obscured by ignorance and prejudice. It is the Old World which the International Congress hopes to include, and already has that Old World begun to make its flag. This banner holds but one star, which Mr. Archer has suggested it should include. Whether that banner shall be the ultimate banner of the world, we cannot say,—probably not, because we are all in an evolutionary movement, and the International Council of Women recognizes itself as an evolution. The possibility of our movement has been born out of the struggles, the hopes, the agitations, the growing faith in the other movements that have tended toward the salvation of humanity and the solidarity of humanity for which our Council stands.

MRS. SPENCER:

We will now all rise and dismiss ourselves with the hymn "Heroes of Peace."

HEROES OF PEACE.

ANNA GARLIN SPENCER.

Sir Arthur S. Sullivan.

Hail the Hero workers of the mighty Past!
 They whose labor builded all the things that last.
 Thoughts of wisest meaning; deeds of noblest right;
 Patient toil in weakness; battles in the night;
 Hail, then, noble workers, builders of the Past!
 All whose lives have blest us with the gains that last.

Hail ye, Hero workers, who to-day do hear
 Duty's myriad voices sounding high and clear;
 Ye who quick responding, haste ye to your task,
 Be it grand or simple, ye forget to ask!
 Hail ye, noble workers, builders of to-day,
 Who life's treasures gather, that shall last alway.

Hail ye, Hero workers, ye who yet shall come,
 When to the world's calling all our lips are dumb!
 Ye shall build more nobly if our work be true
 As we pass Life's treasure on from Old to New.
 Hail ye, then, all workers, of all lands and time,
 One brave band of Heroes with one task sublime.

FIFTH SESSION
COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL ASPECTS
OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

HOTEL ASTOR

Tuesday Afternoon, April Sixteenth, at 3

MARCUS M. MARKS Presiding

MR. MARKS :

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: In the name of Mr. Andrew Carnegie, and on behalf of the Committee of Commerce and Industry of the National Peace Congress, I convey to you all a very hearty welcome to this meeting.

We note that there are a large number of ladies present, but is it surprising to find them at a meeting of commerce and industry when you consider that, without the ladies, commerce and industry would be bankrupt! (Applause—laughter.)

There are two things which we must do in this cause, looking at it in a practical way. The one is to express a sentiment; the second is to back up that sentiment by action, by practical deeds.

The merchants and manufacturers of this country are so deeply interested in the cause of peace that they will, I am sure, do two things: give time and give money to the Peace Movement. A great battleship costs eight million dollars, I understand.

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES: Ten!

MR. MARKS: Ten million dollars. The price has gone up. (Laughter.) Dollars are called the sinews of war. Now, let this meeting of Industry and Peace decide that dollars are the sinews of Peace. (Applause.) Because I am sure that the merchants will agree that a million dollars expended in furthering the cause of Peace will save more than one ten-million dollar warship. And that is a fine investment for us all.

Merchants have a twofold interest in encouraging movements tending to substitute a system of law and order for war in the settlement of differences between nations.

They share with the professional community the sentimental aversion to the injustice and terrors of war; but in addition to this they have what is sometimes called a selfish interest which prompts them to put additional energy into the task of preserving peaceful commercial relations at home and abroad.

For commerce (and consequently the welfare of all the people of every country) depends upon the stability of government and the friendly relation between nations, for the uninterrupted and profitable exchange of commodities to the fullest extent. The fact is recognized that only such nations as are in peaceful and friendly contact can thoroughly, sympathetically and satisfactorily study and supply each other's wants, thus developing mutual trading most successfully. I am told that some merchants preserve a neutral attitude towards the Peace movement because they believe that there is a financial gain in case of war from the sale of battleships, arms, powder, uniforms, food and other necessities. It may be true that these calculations are correct from the narrow standpoint of their own immediate interests, but no one can doubt that the general financial loss caused by the interruption of commerce on account of war far offsets this small gain to a few.

But can it be that there is a human being mean enough to use this as an argument, or to act upon such a motive, to be willing to have his fellow-man suffer incalculably that he may profit in a small degree?

The merchants of America certainly rise above any such considerations and stand shoulder to shoulder with the statesmen and the professional men in their earnest endeavor to extend the spirit of brotherhood till it embraces all mankind. I can speak authoritatively on this point for the National Association of Clothiers, representing the third largest manufacturing industry in the United States. At our National Convention held in Boston last month we unanimously and enthusiastically endorsed the principles and aims of this Peace Congress. And as I look you in the eyes to-day, you merchants and manufacturers, representing all our industries in every section of our great country, I feel absolutely certain that when you are asked how you stand on the question of International Peace there will be one mighty "Aye!" in its favor.

We all recognize the fact that the day for settling differ-

ences between men by the duel is practically over. As individuals we no longer try to decide who is right and who is wrong by test of swordsmanship or brute strength, but resort instead to the impartial judgment of the courts. Is it not time that differences between nations be settled in the same manner, not by arms, but by an international court of justice? The age of the savage has gone forever. Man now clasps the hand of his fellow-man in love, and Americans who bow in reverence to the majesty of the law of our land should be the first to extend the code of international law, so that the death struggle between nations should be no more.

Let the united voice of the business community, the practical men of affairs in this country, ring loud and true so that its echo reverberates at the Hague Peace Conference next June with the message: "Peace, Peace, Peace!" (Applause.)

Ladies and gentlemen, if a man saves a human life we call him a hero; if a man saves thousands of human lives what shall we call him? There is a man here present at my right, a nobleman—if nobleman there ever was—who, by sacrificing his time, his means, his brain, his health, has saved thousands and thousands of lives in minimizing war. (Applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!") He is a man who stands at the head of the gallant band throughout the world, striving for a day of brotherhood among men. It gives me pleasure—and I consider it a great honor—to be able to introduce to you to-day Baron d'Estournelles de Constant. (Applause.)

International Conciliation

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I should not like to deceive you. I am far from being as good as the Chairman says (laughter),—I am simply a man of good-will. It is as a man of good-will and, I should say, as a man of some experience, that I came here, and that I am extremely happy and proud to have this splendid opportunity to address not only an American audience, but especially an audience of American business men, American people devoted to the great questions of commerce and

exchange, which are indeed questions of Peace itself, because you cannot separate those two ideas, commerce and Peace. (Applause.)

Ladies and gentlemen, yesterday I said—or I tried to say, because it was not very easy in a very large room—I tried to express my feeling of admiration for the American people—ladies as well as gentlemen—by saying that they are keen and clever enough to understand that it is not only their duty, but their interest, to meet and show that they are not indifferent to the question of Peace. In Europe they are indifferent; in Europe we have that state of mind which has been so aptly described by our Chairman; the state of mind of a people who are neutral, who are always waiting for somebody else to take the lead in a movement; a state of mind which is always waiting for a progress which might already have been attained, a progress the realization of which is still in the future. But in America I know we can always find an audience receptive to high ideas, and I am happy and proud of the privilege of addressing such an audience.

It is indeed an inspiring thing that this New World, understanding the truth, should show it to the Old World, and that the Old World should follow very obediently in its footsteps. (Applause.) That is right; we must not complain; it is much better to do that than to resist. The Europeans will follow you; they will follow even more closely if they see that you have not only organized—shall I say—sentimental manifestations, but that you have brought about practical ways of promoting the progress of your work and of attaining success.

It is not enough for us to say that we are devoted to truth, to justice, to peace. Those are mere words. We all agree to the expression of such sentiments; but what the world says is that we are always speaking of very fine ideals and using very fine phrases, but that we do not speak of the ways and means of realizing those ideals.

It is therefore time for us to speak of the means and methods of carrying out our ideals of international justice. For international and national justice are now very clearly defined. We know that we have to organize arbitration; that arbitration is much better than quarreling; that arbitration, of course, is much better than war. This idea has become understood little

by little, and it is because it is understood that you have seen the first Hague Conference, which has been practically the first international tribunal. But this practical, very practical organization, this quite matter-of-fact organization, has not yet been fully understood, although it existed. So we have been obliged, a few friends of mine and myself, to come here and ask the American people to take the lead, to ask the American people to show the way for these new institutions, to impress European public opinion and oblige them to make use of this great Court.

It is not an old story, it is quite a recent one, and very striking. In 1902, three years after the meeting of the first Hague Conference, the Hague Court, the permanent tribunal, had been founded, but nobody wanted to use it. The governments said it is of no use. I said, "Of course it is of no use, but simply because you do not make use of it. (Laughter.) It is for you to use it; if you do not use it, do not reproach the tribunal, reproach yourselves." But they did not. (Laughter—applause.) They did not, and I must tell you that the only man who understood that was your President, Theodore Roosevelt. (Applause.) This is not paying him a vain compliment; it is true, and that is one reason why he has been considered, and is considered now, as one of the great pacificators of our times.

President Roosevelt, seeing that it was a great pity that this new institution, still greater than your great Supreme Court, had been created and was not used, said: "What shall I do to give it life, to give it true existence? Well, the simplest thing is to give it a case, I must give it something to do—something to eat, if you like."

So the government of the United States and the government of the Republic of Mexico agreed to send to the Hague Court its first case, about this time of the year 1902. That was the beginning, and anyone would have thought—as I myself did—that that would have been sufficient to persuade the other governments to follow the example. No, no; not enough. In a few months a very serious difficulty arose, about which many of you know very well. It was a very great difficulty, the Venezuela affair. Several European countries were involved in it. It would have been rather disastrous to start a war of all Europe against that poor little Venezuela. So it became a matter

of arbitration, and would you not have thought that the European governments, being obliged to arbitrate, would at last have wanted to go before the Hague Tribunal? Not at all. Instead they sent a very fine telegram to President Roosevelt, asking him to be the arbitrator, and hoping that he would be flattered by their offer. They believed that President Roosevelt would be weak enough to accept that honor and forget the Hague Court, that he had been the first to advocate. Fortunately,—and that is what I admire about him above everything—President Roosevelt was firm enough, good enough, straightforward man enough (applause), to send a plain and very decisive answer. He said: “No, I cannot accept that. I stick to The Hague.” (Applause and cries of “Hear! Hear!”) “I stick to The Hague,” he said. “You have created that European, that international, that universal institution; it is to be used. It has been good once, it will be good another time, for another experiment. Let us go to The Hague.” And then the lethargy was broken, and to-day that Hague Court is full of life; for since that time the governments, when they were obliged to follow, wanted to follow altogether. They have signed treaties of arbitration, and everybody now is wanting to sign such treaties; everybody is wanting to go to the Hague Court; and I consider that very great progress. This progress is in large part due to President Roosevelt, to American initiative and energy. But there is another influence, a very good influence, which I must not forget to speak about. One of the reasons why the Hague Court had been forgotten and left alone was because it was poor. It had no home, it had no place for the judges, for the cases of the future, except a very unsatisfactory little building, which had to be let every year. There we have another sample of the disdain of governments. They would spend thousands of millions every year for war expenses, but they could not give a few dollars for the beginning of the organization of Peace. They refused the small amount of money needed for this great scheme, and then American initiative, American energy, arose. It was Mr. Andrew Carnegie who said: “It may be that the Hague Court is disdained because it is poor, but if we give it a home, if we endow it, then it will receive consideration,” and that consideration has come because Mr. Carnegie gave to the Court of The Hague a very fine and very large palace, worthy of the Court, worthy of

Europe, worthy of America. (Applause.) Was I not right in telling you, ladies and gentlemen, that you may be proud of your country? It may be that the Hague Court is far away from us, it may be that the Hague Court is in Europe, but it is living because of the initiative, living because of the heart and the intelligence of America. (Applause.)

Now, to come back to a practical view of the subject, you are quite right in supporting such a movement. This movement in favor of international justice must not be the mere devotion of one man, even a man such as the first magistrate of your great Republic. It must be the devotion of your whole country. You must not leave to the President, or to a few statesmen, the great honor of supporting the idea of international justice. You must all take your share in that support, and that is why I am so happy to see that you have come here in such large numbers, representing so great a strength as the strength of the commercial, industrial and the agricultural activities of the United States.

It is a very noble thing, and I assure you that what you have done to-day will not be lost in France, in Germany, or in England. I found many difficulties. Many of my friends, even of my relatives, said that when I left my fine career of diplomat, I lost everything. They said that I have lost myself, yet in France I still find everywhere very good friends, devoted friends, who have been touched by the very great difficulties I met; and I can tell you that it is a very strengthening thing to find, as I found, more friends in my difficulties than I did in my fine days. (Great applause.) I have found friends whom I can trust, and I am not so sure about the first ones. (Applause.) When I go back to France, when I tell them that you in America are so interested in this great question, they will be pleased, because they want this encouragement. It will not be lost, and you will see them in a very short time trying to shake hands with you and trying to organize something.

Organize what? We never lose sight of that question of organization. We now have arbitration, which is much better than war, but we must find something that will be still better than arbitration. This something you will find, I know, and you will give it life. Arbitration is very good, because it settles the difficulties when they arise, but it is still more important to settle

these difficulties before they arise. Settle them before, but how? That is very easy. Of course, I do not say that we can settle all difficulties. Human nature is so different, and we have difficulties even with ourselves. I do not know whether you in America are as I am—in perpetual conflict with myself. (Laughter.) At times there are two men speaking in me, one who tries to be good, but the other who is not always so good. (Laughter.) The bad one sometimes, very often, tries to give me very bad advice. (Laughter.) But I try not to follow such advice, and then arises the conflict. Then I must settle that conflict by arbitration, but I try to avoid having the conflict. That is still better. You must have that prevention organized, if you can. What is the best way? I will tell you: after many, many, many researches I found, through my friends in France and in other countries in Europe, I found that everywhere, and chiefly in commerce, there are many men and women who are extremely devoted to their work, but they are always speaking of American money. In America as in France—of course, money is a means and a way of doing things—but here as in France, also many good people are more devoted to their conscience, to the good of their country, to the good of their kind, than to money and material interests. (Applause.) All the good people of our time need only one thing—to know each other. When one man is isolated he is weak, he can do almost nothing; he hardly dares to express what he feels, because he feels so lonely in this immense, indifferent world. But put all these good men and women into relations with each other, let them become acquainted, let them correspond, so that they can exchange their ideas and information, then instead of isolation and weakness, you will get a real and powerful strength.

That is what we have been doing with that very small thing which was at first our International Conciliation movement. It was a very small thing, indeed, like a germ; but this small thing is growing and will become great. This International Conciliation movement is to be developed from the groups of the good people of every country, and when a group of the good people in every country has been created, then will come a kind of federation—a trust, if I may say so—of all the national groups; and these people from all over the world will make the most powerful association you can imagine. It is not an association for money;

it is not an association for power, but it is an association for insuring the triumph of good-will. If you do not have this association, if good-will always remains silent and inactive, you may be sure that bad passions, that jingoism and selfishness are sure to win without a struggle. If, on the contrary, you associate, it will be easy for you at once to prevent the misunderstandings, the difficulties and sometimes the catastrophies which arise from ignorance alone.

Now this is so well understood in America, certainly among the best of the public men, the politicians, artists, business men, agriculturists, and the clergy, that they have said that it is the right thing to do, to-morrow. Now you, ladies and gentlemen, you must try to help. We do not ask for money, at least I do not ask for money. What I want is your moral help, your clear knowledge, your clear intelligence applied to your own interests. If you understand your own interests you will understand the interests of all the world, because there is no antagonism, there is sympathy, there is solidarity between all the interests of all the people of the world who work together. We have against us nothing but idle and bad people, but people like you must agree or you will never, my dear friends, accomplish anything. You must then join this International Conciliation Association. I personally disappear in that; I am and I want to be nothing. I found in America the good, the very good, the soundest people have joined the American Branch of the International Conciliation Association. The Honorary President is Andrew D. White, my old and honorable friend of The Hague, who has also been Ambassador at Berlin (applause), and he is certainly one of the most respected men I have ever met. The other man is the President of this Congress, Andrew Carnegie. I have nothing to say of him after all you have seen and heard these days; then there is the effective President, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University. (Applause.) Then I see that we have Mr. Straus, my friend here, if he will allow me to name him. We have practical men, and among them I think Mr. Straus is a very good example. Mr. Straus is one of the honorary members of the committee, so is Mr. Elihu Root, and Mr. John Hay was another. (Applause.) We have, I assure you, the most disinterested men you can find in America. If you will kindly apply to President Nicholas Murray Butler, he will send you

all the information about this Association, and you will find no better way of coming to an understanding with people of this same mind in all the countries of Europe. When we are all in touch, all in good relations, we may be sure there can be no misunderstanding, that international conflicts will be more and more rare, and that you will have done a great deal to prevent them

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have finished; but I shall not be satisfied if I do not express to you as well as I can—I do not mean in an eloquent way, but I mean as sincerely as I possibly can—how happy I am to have seen you. I am very happy to have the feeling—I think I am not deceived in having the feeling—that we quite agree; that you understand perfectly that my journey, although the crossing was very bad (laughter), was not useless. When I return to France I shall be with my family and with my friends, and when they reproach me for being always away from home, I shall tell them it is true; I am very often absent; I am very often far from my country, but I think I have been doing a good work; and I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for having given me that good feeling. (Great applause.)

MR. MARKS:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: This meeting of commerce and industry is to be congratulated, because we have here to-day a cabinet officer, a representative of our government from the Department of Commerce and Labor. It would be presumptuous on my part to introduce this gentleman to you, because he is so well known to every American audience. I present the Hon. Oscar S. Straus. (Great applause.)

(As Mr. Straus came forward to address the meeting, Baron d'Estournelles arose.)

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Allow me to tell you one thing that I was telling my friend, Mr. Straus. I was telling him that you were really a very hurrying nation. You think that my participation in the program is finished now and that there remains to me only the pleasure of listening to Mr. Straus. No, no; it is not that way. The committee has told me that I was to speak here at three, that very likely I should be free at four, and that then an automobile would wait for me at the door (laughter)

and take me to another place, where I am to address a meeting. (Laughter.) That other meeting is a very important one. I shall not address there business men, I shall not address ladies and gentlemen, but there I shall address thousands and thousands of children. (Applause.) These American children will be the business men and women of to-morrow. They will have to follow your work, which you understand so well, and therefore I am not able to remain and have the pleasure of listening to Mr. Straus, but will go right to the children now. (Great applause.)

MR. STRAUS: I will keep Baron d'Estournelles here for just a minute or two.

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES: Quite right.

MR. STRAUS: And then he can go to the children, but I want to tell an incident—

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES: Good!

MR. STRAUS:—with which his name is connected. Shortly after the last election, or shortly after the President succeeded to the Presidency, Baron d'Estournelles stated that he feared this country, having advanced to the forefront as a commercial nation, would be led by the President into the way of commercialism. Shortly afterward, when the President directed the Venezuelan affair to the Hague Tribunal, having declined to accept the offer of the German Emperor to arbitrate the matter, referred it, as the Baron has described to you, the Baron made a speech in the French Senate—of which he is one of the most distinguished members—and stated that he had feared that the United States, which had reached such a high point in its commercial development and had placed in its executive chair a man who was feared by many, would be a powerful instrument for war; but that he felt now he had not only to apologize to the United States but to proclaim to the world that the United States, with President Roosevelt at its head, had taken the moral leadership of the enlightened nations of the world. (Great applause.) The Baron says “quite true.” I know it was true, I clipped his statements at the time from a French newspaper, and I showed it to President Roosevelt. (Laughter.) I will now let the Baron de Con-

stant go, if he wants to. (Laughter.) But I wish to say—I am not going to make a long speech, I made a long speech last night—

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES: No, not long.

MR. STRAUS: I am going to say only a few words to-day, because there are a number of eminent speakers here, and some from abroad, and I wish to give them the time, because you know I am naturally a peace man, being the head of a department of the government that only can thrive in times of peace. (Applause.)

For many years there has been, and even now there is a kind of shibboleth among the nations, created by a false philosophy, which is embraced in the statement that "trade follows the flag." In other words, the more lands you have conquered, the more wars you have fought, the larger your trade. I know of only one trade that follows the flag of war, and it is the trade of the grave-digger. (Applause.)

Commerce follows along the highways of least resistance—commerce is not extended by the cannon's mouth; on the contrary, times have changed with the expansion of commerce. As the nations have been brought nearer and nearer together by the rapidity of intercommunication, the foreign commerce of the world has within the last forty years taken wonderful leaps and bounds, and the old idea has disappeared that one nation is interested in the weakened condition of other nations. The idea obtained for thousands of years, and obtains yet, in some parts of the world, that as a neighboring nation gets weaker and poorer, the other nations grow greater and more prosperous. The growth of commerce has developed the absolute fallacy of that conclusion. Commerce is reciprocal, based not upon enmity but on fair exchange, on mutuality.

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES: Good. (Applause.)

MR. STRAUS: Absolute mutuality. The richer the surrounding nations, the better it is for the other nations, because they have commodities to exchange, and have money to pay for those commodities; consequently the welfare of nations is absolutely bound together, and each nation is interested in the progress, happiness and welfare of the other; that is one of the chief commercial aspects of the subject of International Peace.

More than that, has it ever occurred to you, looking entirely

at the material side, that after every great war has followed a terrible panic? After the Crimean War in '56 came the dreadful panic of 1857 in Europe and in this country. After the Franco-German War of 1870 followed the dreadful panic of 1873; and so you will find, going farther back, that from this terrible condition of war and the dislocation of all of the peaceful avocations of the people, comes a dreadful period of commercial depression, which sometimes brings within its train almost as much disaster as the war itself.

The people in civilized countries are pretty well agreed as to what is right and what is wrong; we are pretty well agreed as to moral standards and fundamental principles. We know we have no right to steal our neighbor's goods; we know we have no right to shoot down our debtors; we know we have no right, with sword and pistol, to pursue a man because he happens to owe us something, or from whom we claim an obligation. Now, is there any reason in the world that you can imagine why a different standard or basis of morality should exist between a conglomeration of individuals forming a nation and another conglomeration of people constituting another nation, than should exist between the people or the subjects within the limits of each separate nation?

As I explained a little more fully last night, because of the sophisms, the pettifogisms, the perversion of ideas of right, drawn from precedents based upon might instead of right, the present state of international law, as it is found in all the leading text-writers, is this: to nations at war, whom we call belligerents, neutral nations have no right to sell armaments or munitions of war, but it is lawful for the subjects of these neutral nations to sell such armaments and munitions. Neutral nations have no right, as such, to lend money to the belligerent nations, and money to-day is the greatest war-making power in the world. Everything can be purchased, the most destructive machinery of war; it is simply a question of money. Whereas neutral nations under the law of nations are not permitted to lend the belligerent nations money, yet the bankers of a neutral nation are permitted to do it under their law. Isn't that a travesty, a perversion and a sophism? (Applause.)

Now, my dear colleague, Baron d'Estournelles, if you do not succeed—and I do not think you will succeed—in coming to an

agreement at the next Hague Conference, of which you are one of the most distinguished delegates, if you do not succeed in coming to an agreement on the question of the limitation of armaments, I beg of you have the Hague Treaty amended, so that the lending of money to any nation either about to go to war or in war shall be regarded and by international consent pronounced as an unfriendly and hostile act. (Applause.)

(At this point Baron d'Estournelles shook hands with Mr. Straus and left the meeting.)

Ladies and gentlemen, there are many other phases of this subject that I should like to touch upon, but I must deny myself the privilege, as I do not wish to encroach upon the time of the distinguished gentlemen who are to follow me. I thank you very much. (Great applause.)

MR. MARKS :

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Before introducing the next speaker, I should like to read a resolution which has been passed to me by one of the delegates (reading) :

"Whereas, the merchants, manufacturers and farmers of America appreciate very keenly the importance of substituting a system of law and order in place of war in the settlement of international differences;

"Therefore, be it resolved, That we heartily endorse the sentiments and aims of the Peace Congress;

"Resolved, That we recommend the establishment of a National Peace Society in this country for the purposes of conciliation, mediation and arbitration, and authorize the Chairman of this meeting to give assurance to the executive committee of the Peace Congress of our co-operation in the establishment and maintenance of such an organization."

With your consent I will refer this to the executive committee of the Peace Congress.

We have here with us this afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, the president of the largest and most influential association of manufacturers in the United States. That means a great deal at a meeting of commerce and industry, and I take pleasure in introducing to you Mr. James W. Van Cleave, President of the National Association of Manufacturers. (Applause.)

The Importance of Peace to Industry

JAMES W. VAN CLEAVE.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Following, as I am, such men of distinction and representing, as I seem to do, by being the only manufacturer here, such a body of men as the manufacturers of America, it seems that I may be pardoned, at least I hope that I may be pardoned, if I use my manuscript.

As a representative of the manufacturing industries of the United States I am proud of the invitation which has been extended to me to address the eminent men from all over the world who are gathered here to devise means to promote the cause of International Peace. It is hardly necessary for me to say that I am heartily in accord with the object of this assemblage. We manufacturers are interested in World Peace both as humanitarians and as business men. On the latter phase of our interest I will say a few words to you to-day.

Stated in terms of money, this interest can be shown to be large. In the aggregate the manufactures of the United States far exceed those of any other two countries. Our production of pig iron in 1906 equaled that of Great Britain, Germany and France together, and these are our nearest competitors. If there be any virtue, therefore, in the multiplication methods of appraising things, the interest of the American manufacturers in this vast issue is large.

At this hour a capital of \$14,000,000,000 is invested in the mills and factories of the United States, and these employ over 3,500,000 persons, who will receive \$4,000,000,000 in wages for this year. The finished products of these factories will, for 1907, amount to over \$16,000,000,000. This stupendous sum, which is too large for us to adequately interpret in comprehensible terms, is as great as the value of the entire property, real and personal, of the United States in 1860, at the time of Lincoln's first election. It is as large as the value of all the property of Spain in these prosperous days of Alfonso XIII.

Moreover, much of this vast total depends for its existence on the maintenance of our commerce with the world, for in 1906 we exported over \$700,000,000 in manufactures. In our sales of manufactures abroad we rank next to Great Britain and Germany.

Now, I am not saying that the pocket interest in anything is

the largest that civilized man can have. There are moral considerations which make a stronger appeal to us to work for Peace than can be expressed in terms of pounds, francs, marks or dollars. Other speakers at the sessions of this assemblage, however, have already dealt on the ethical side of the Peace question, and have done it more adequately than I could do it. And, as I understand, others are still to speak on that side. I shall therefore confine myself to the strictly business phase of the subject.

Many persons think that war promotes commerce, and that thus it aids farmers, manufacturers and all sorts of producers. But this is true only for the moment. The Russo-Japanese war increased America's sales to Japan, Russia and China while the war was going on, but it decreased those sales immediately afterward. To the extent of the drain made upon their resources by the war those countries will have to economize for a few years. Their purchases from the outside world will be smaller.

To an immeasurably greater extent than ever before the world has become one great family. International commerce has had a very large place in promoting this solidarity. In one degree or another whatever aids one country benefits all the rest. Disaster, too, is universal in its consequences. Most of us who are here to-day, no matter which side of the Atlantic or which side of the Pacific we hail from, remember the fall of the great London financial and commercial house of Baring Brothers in 1890. The crash was heard around the world. It helped to start the trade dislocation which, in the next few years, striking every country successively, circled the globe.

In the financial flurry two or three weeks ago the drop one morning on the Berlin bourse registered itself instantaneously in the London market, and it immediately sent prices down on the New York Stock Exchange. To-day famine in large districts of Russia and China deprives the United States, England, Germany and every other commercial country of many patrons, just as last year's famine in part of Japan did. Cain's query, Am I my brother's keeper? cannot be answered to-day as Cain would have answered it. To a certain degree the humanitarian spirit of this age makes every man his brother's keeper.

As I said a moment ago, the war between Japan and Russia, while it lasted helped our trade with those countries, and also

with China, in part of whose territory the war was waged. But it retarded trade afterward. It killed hundreds of thousands of men, and it impoverished millions. All of us manufacturers thus lost many patrons. Dead men buy no clothes. Paupers cannot pay for any.

In the ancient world rivers, mountains, deserts and seas separated peoples. Separations made them strangers to each other, and, as strangers, they became enemies. Steam and electricity have changed all this. The railroads have blotted out the mountains, the rivers and the deserts. The steamers have abolished the oceans. With their cargoes of merchandise and passengers, the railroads and the steamboats, aided by the marine and the land telegraphs, have made all the world's peoples speak a common tongue, and have brought the four corners of the globe into close proximity.

International commerce is the greatest promoter of International Peace that any of us can name. If Swift was right when he said that the man who made two blades of grass grow where only one grew before deserved better of mankind than did the whole race of politicians, doubly blest must be the man or the nation that puts two lines of steamers on the ocean or builds two lines of railway across international frontiers where only one existed previously. The lines which carry passengers and commodities between Paris and Berlin are doing more to maintain harmony between France and Germany than are all the Peace Societies of the two countries.

Dr. Lardner, a very wise man who was still alive when many of us who are here to-day were boys, predicted that, as a commercial proposition, it would be forever impossible to build boats which would cross the Atlantic by steam. No boat, he said, could carry enough coal to make steam for those 3,000 miles of transit. And he proved it, too, to the satisfaction of many persons, wise and unwise, for he was very handy with figures.

Before Dr. Lardner died, a little less than half a century ago, the Cunard, Collins, Inman, Allen, Hamburg-American and other lines of steamers crossed the Atlantic in the regular trade between England and other European countries and the United States. Steamboats, too, were running on the Pacific. Four or five years before Dr. Lardner died, his country, Great Britain, sent a merchant steamer all around the globe, making the circuit

that Magellan, Drake and Cook made long before his time, and making it not only far quicker, but in far greater safety and comfort for its crew.

Lowell's injunction is something which all of us should keep constantly in mind. We must never prophecy unless we know. Steamboats are now making the Atlantic trip almost as familiar and nearly as safe as that from New York to Brooklyn or to Jersey City. The voyage by sailing vessels from England to the United States which took several weeks of time when George II. was king, can be made in the same number of days by steamer in his great grandson, Edward VII.'s age.

And the improved relations which have been established between the two countries are largely due to the shortening and the cheapening of the time distance between them, and the consequent expansion in the commerce which passes from one to the other. To a certain extent all international trade is reciprocal. Each country buys from its neighbors as well as sells to them. And the more buying and selling which is transacted between them, the better friends they become, and the greater the stake which they have in maintaining peace with each other. For selfish as well as for humanitarian reasons each is interested in the other's welfare. Each figuratively greets the other with Rip Van Winkle's salutation, "May you live long and prosper."

Speaking for men of my own guild, I say that we have an especial incentive to work for the maintenance of amicable relations with all countries. More and more every year the products of America's factories outrun the demands of America's consumers. To a constantly increasing degree we are under the necessity of looking for new and broader markets in England, Germany, France, China, Japan and every other land. It is only by the preservation of Peace that we can get these markets, or hold them when we do get them.

For this as well as for many other reasons, as I look around this hall to-day I greet every man in it as a kinsman, regardless of the language which he speaks or the color of his skin. The Russian, the Japanese, the Englishman, the German, the Frenchman, the Mexican and everybody within sound of my voice I hail as a brother, in whose life and welfare I have an interest. Each produces something that we manufacturers want to buy. Each asks for something that we have to sell.

But we Americans cannot work effectively for harmony between the nations until we get peace at home. We must have Industrial Peace like that for which the Citizens' Industrial Association, of which I have the honor to be one of the founders, has been working with such success for years. We want Peace like that which President Roosevelt's commission, just formed, which had its origin in the Nobel prize, seeks to establish. Harmony between employers in all callings and between employers and workers, is one of the things which we aim to bring about. We must have peace between the great political parties by abolishing the demagogues in each of them, and by keeping them clean. Then when we speak in behalf of peace for all nations we will be speaking with the voice of 85,000,000 of people, representing the most populous country in the world except China and Russia, a country which has without exception as much wealth as any two nations in the world combined.

American manufacturers have an especial reason to work for an arbitration board to settle international controversies. The arbitration, however, must be based on justice. We want some tribunal in which the leading nations of the world are represented; one that will consider and adjust peaceably issues in dispute between countries. A court which represents the public sentiment of the world, reinforced if necessary by the armies and the navies of the great nations, will command respect. But in order to bring the right sort of a settlement—and this is the only kind of a settlement which will stay settled—the Peace Tribunal's rulings must be based on the elemental and eternal principles of justice, which appeal to all men.

While no man in this great assemblage would rejoice more sincerely than I would at the establishment of Universal and Eternal Peace, I am compelled by circumstances to say that the United States cannot safely lose sight of Cromwell's injunction to "keep your powder dry." Great Britain, Spain and the United States are to propose, in the Hague Peace Conference in June, a limitation of the armaments of the nations. Russia, Germany and Austria have given notice that they will oppose this proposition. This means that many years must pass before the nations disband their armies and navies, or place any restriction on their expansion. Tennyson's "parliament of man and federation of the world" will not come in the lifetime of anybody in this hall. I

wish it were here in 1907, or that we could be assured of getting it in 1917 or 1927, but as practical men we must pay a decent regard to the conditions which confront us.

"To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." These were the words of a man who was first in Peace as well as first in war. They were the words of a lover of the entire human race—George Washington. And, happily, they are just as applicable to the America of to-day as they were to the America to which they were directed.

The United States must be friendly to all races and all peoples. It must meet all its obligations as a member of the family of nations. When disagreements arise, if they ever do arise, between us and any other nation, we must so order our conduct that it will appeal to the world's sense of fairness and justice. We shall then be able to submit our claims to any intelligent and impartial tribunal with the faith that our position will command the world's approval.

But suppose that, even with the right on our side, justice is denied to us. What then? Then we must accept Davy Crockett's doctrine. Being sure that we are right, we must go ahead.

There are some issues—issues of honor, of principle, of national safety—which cannot consistently be referred to any international tribunal. What would have happened if we had submitted to arbitration that hands-off-the-American-continent warning which Monroe in 1823 directed against the Holy Alliance, which intended to subjugate the little countries to the south of us that had just broken away from Spain? If we had presented our case to any International Tribunal which could have been set up in that day, we would have been thrown out of court. The whole European world, except England, would have been against us. Europe was the only part of the world which was on the map in that day, except the United States, and there were many rulers who thought that the contour of the world's map would be improved if the United States were removed from it.

The world of 1823 would have told us that those little mongrel countries of Central and South America would have been better taken care of if they had remained under Spain's control than if they were left to manage their own affairs. The arbitrators could easily have shown that Spain was a leader in the world's civilization, with many centuries of history behind her,

even before she sent Columbus over here to discover a continent peopled by a few million savages, all of whom were half-naked except those who were wholly naked. It would not have been hard for any arbitrators of four-fifths of a century ago to prove to their own satisfaction that any one of the members of the Holy Alliance—Alexander of Russia, Louis XVIII of France, Frederick William of Prussia, or Francis of Austria—knew better what was good for Mexico, Bolivia, Chili and their neighbors than did those countries' Presidents or people.

Yet, the Monroe policy must be applauded by the assemblage of Peace Promoters which I am addressing. It was one of the longest steps in the direction of Universal Peace which the world has ever seen. It removed one-half of the globe from the clashing ambitions and jealousies of the Old World's sovereigns and politicians. By preventing the partitioning of the American continent among the nations of Europe it has headed off such conflicts as that of 1904-05 between a European and an Asiatic nation for supremacy in one great region of Asia. It has also averted such wars as that of a few years ago between England and the two little Boer republics in Africa, a war which subverted those republics.

Translated into concrete phrase the Monroe doctrine means that Americans must be allowed to rule America. The rule that some of those countries is putting up is crude, but it is home rule, and it is improving. This rule carries the trademark, "Made in America." Zelaya of Nicaragua in 1907 may be more tyrannical than was the Yankee pirate, William Walker, who ruled Nicaragua in 1857, but he is a home-made product, and so long as his own people can stand his rule, the rest of the world, including the United States, must let them have it.

Under the Monroe policy the world sees a Mexico, a Brazil, a Chili, an Argentina and a Peru which compare favorably with the progressive and enlightened people of the rest of the globe. As a result of this policy there are twenty republics in the Western Hemisphere now as compared with one a century ago. And if this continent had been left open to spoliation by Europe's sovereigns, it is not at all certain that this one republic would be here now. If here, it would have immeasurably less influence in the world's affairs than it exerts to-day.

I sincerely hope that this assemblage of Peacemakers from all

the continents will be able to wield an influence in their respective countries which will make wars as few in the Old World as they have been in the New, and that it will create a sentiment that will eventually abolish wars in the New World and the Old.

There is an especial propriety in holding this Peace Conference in a city which has more races and languages in its make-up than are found even in London or Constantinople. To us Americans, who are composed of a blend of all the peoples of the earth, every Peace Movement makes a particularly powerful appeal. War by us against any nation would be a war between brothers united by the tie of a common humanity.

Floating this afternoon in this harbor and around this hall are the flags of nearly every country under the sun. I hail all these flags as flags of Peace, messengers from peoples with whom I hope my own country will remain on the warmest terms of friendship forever.

MR. MARKS :

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN : There was quite a little war philosophy in the last peace talk (laughter), but Peace Congresses must learn to listen and to argue, patiently and quietly. You cannot force Peace. You have got to get at it by discussion. (Applause.) Last night a gentleman made a remark which I would like to quote as a complete answer to one of the statements Mr. Van Cleave made: "The world is better to-day than it was yesterday, and we all feel that it is going to be better to-morrow than it is to-day." (Applause.)

The next speaker, ladies and gentlemen, is a Vice-President of the National Civic Federation. He is ex-Governor of the State of New Hampshire, and Master of a great farmers' organization called the National Grange. It gives me pleasure to introduce to you Hon. N. J. Bachelder. (Applause.)

Agriculture and the Peace Movement

HON. NAHUM J. BACHELDER.

I am from a section of the country typical of Peace. The first white settlers to land at Plymouth Rock, upon the rough New England coast, had left their mother country to avoid conflict, and braved the dangers of the broad ocean upon a peaceful errand. They encountered the hardships imposed by climate and

the danger of the crafty redman, to maintain the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, manifesting perhaps greater bravery than would be required upon the battlefield. Those early settlers established no armies and constructed no battleships, but quietly followed the peaceful avocations of tilling the soil and establishing a race of peace-loving people. When the oppression of the mother country reached them, even there they simply pitched the old lady's tea into Boston harbor and quietly returned to their flocks and herds. From then till now New England has been exceptionally free from bloody war, as well as from industrial strife, although her people are always ready to respond in defense of the country and the old flag.

In 1905 the great nations of Russia and Japan, having destroyed thousands of human lives and billions of dollars' worth of property in cruel war, cast their eyes over the entire world for a place in which to come to an amicable agreement. Finally, their representatives met upon the peaceful shores of New England, close by where the Pilgrims landed a few centuries before, and there entered into a Treaty of Peace that will go down in history as one of the greatest peace movements the world ever knew. It is a matter of profound regret that they did not meet upon this mission of peace before, rather than after, the bloody conflict. For these and other reasons I am justified in saying that I am from a section of our country typical of Peace.

I am here, however, not to represent this, or any other section of the country, but to represent the great industry of agriculture and those engaged in it. I believe the interests of agriculture are the most important of any represented in this movement for Universal Peace, for the husbandman is the most important factor among the industrial classes. When the products of his labor are reduced, the fires in our great furnaces burn lower, the spindles in our great factories turn with less rapidity, the trains upon our railroads run with less frequency, and the goods upon the shelves of our great mercantile houses begin to gather dust. When the farms of the country yield abundant crops, as they have in recent years, abandoned forges are kindled anew, manufacturers are unable to fill orders and transportation facilities become clogged. Agriculture furnishes the mainspring of industrial activity.

The ways of agriculture are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are Peace. Besides being a peace lover by nature, the hus-

bandman from Adam down has found his pleasure and profit in sitting by his own vine and fig tree. While he can fight to save his country, whether it be in South Africa or in England, or under the Stars and Stripes, he has no taste for blood and thunder, and beats his sword into a pruning hook as soon as the battle is over. With shattered nerves, impaired fortune and devastated home he sets himself resolutely to work to provide the material which will restore prosperity to his own and other industries.

The heaviest public burdens the farmer has to bear are the taxes laid to support military establishments the world over, and Universal Peace would usher in utopian conditions. Great standing armies, magnificent battleships and impregnable fortifications cost vast sums of money and can be sustained only by wealthy nations. If these constitute the most effectual means of preserving peace, no expenditure of money is too great compared with the sacrifice of human life and the devastation of home by cruel wars. The lurking suspicion that the peaceful influence from this source may have been over-estimated, and that there is a safer and surer road to Universal Peace than through preparation for war, is found in the call for this Peace Congress by leading patriotic statesmen. Arbitration has done much in the industrial world in averting expensive conflicts between capital and labor and to the advantage of all the people. An extension of this policy to the adjustment of differences of a character and magnitude that otherwise would plunge nations into war, would be of still greater advantage to all the people, and to no class more than the farmers. They may not feel the disastrous effects of war so quickly as other people, but it finally rests upon them as the great producing class.

Great victories consist in something more than the ability of one nation to conquer another by force of arms. Many so-called victories have spelled defeat when all the results were taken into account, for spectacular effect may obscure the tangible results. Real victory is measured by the result, compared with the sacrifices made to secure it. In most cases this can be secured through arbitration. There may be occasional instances when there is no common ground upon which nations can meet, but such instances are no rarer in the dealings between nations than in dealings between individuals.

I will not presume to suggest how this can be brought about,

for those who have been prominent in arranging this Congress are skilled in national and international affairs. It is reasonably certain that such wide publicity as will be given to these proceedings will have effect in promoting a sentiment for Universal Peace throughout the civilized world. It is also probable that the magnificent contributions to the cause of education made by the distinguished President of this Congress will have marked effect for all future time in promoting the Peace sentiment. The establishment of libraries and the endowment of institutions of learning through his great liberality is resulting in raising the standard of intelligence among the people, and as intelligence develops, warlike tendencies decline among people and among nations.

I thank you, Mr. President, for recognizing the great agricultural industry of the country by extending an invitation to representatives of it to attend this Congress. It may be a far cry from our humble homes upon the farms to the magnificence of this metropolis, but without the products of the farm and the toil of millions of farmers there would be no palatial surroundings anywhere. My only object upon this occasion, so graciously accorded me, is to express the sentiment of the farmers in regard to the disastrous effects of war, their deep interest in the objects of this Peace Congress, and to pledge their support to any policies that may be inaugurated by it for the promotion of Universal Peace. We believe that if wars can be averted, all industrial and commercial interests will be promoted without detracting one iota from our dignity as citizens, or from our standing as a nation among the nations of the world. An aroused public sentiment is the true basis for securing Universal Peace.

My friends, I thank you for listening to me so patiently. I bring you the greetings of the farmers of the country in this grand work, and I say to you that they have not much sympathy with the military spirit that seems to be dominating at present every country of the world, but rather they believe in the good old doctrine bequeathed to us by our fathers: "Peace on earth, good-will to men." (Great applause.)

MR. MARKS:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I think I express the sentiment of everyone here when I say to the representative of a million farmers who has brought this lovely message to us: "Thank you, Mr. Bachelder." (Applause.)

We have with us a gentleman who represents twenty-one republics. His voice should count. He is ex-Minister to Colombia and he is now Director of the International Bureau of American Republics at Washington. It gives me great pleasure to introduce the Hon. John Barrett.

The Permanency of the Pan-American Union

JOHN BARRETT.

If one fact stands out more prominently than any other before the world in regard to the International Conferences of the American Republics, it is that these assemblages are now recognized as coming at regular intervals and as accomplishing great and significant results. Their bearing on the peace and good relations of the countries of the western hemisphere cannot be overestimated. They have so much to do with promoting harmony of interests among the nations concerned that all other Governments of the world, especially those of Europe, must concede that they are second only in international significance to those gathering at The Hague. While all kinds of questions affecting the mutual welfare of the American Republics come before them for consideration and discussion, the one central thought inspiring the best effort on the part of the delegates is that the resolutions debated or approved tend to promote a better understanding and truer friendship among them all.

The three Conferences that have been held during the last fifteen years have been notable successes. They have accomplished far more than is commonly supposed. They have been attended by the ablest men of the different nations participating, and they have adjourned only after the majority of the delegates felt that they had satisfactorily concluded their labors. Like all Conferences they have passed numerous resolutions and made many recommendations which have not been formally accepted or approved by the respective Governments of the delegates signing such documents, but they have set many wheels of Pan-American activities in motion that would never have been started otherwise. It is, moreover, safe to say that they have acted as a deterring influence, not only on wars between American nations, but on revolutions within the limits of different countries. Since

these Conferences first began to assemble, the American Republics have been getting closer and closer together, and the number of revolutions has greatly decreased. Because at the moment there may be a struggle going on among some of the smaller States of Central America, there can be no conclusion drawn adverse to the tranquillity and good relations of the great and powerful Republics of Latin America, from Mexico, on the north, to Brazil, Argentina and Chili, on the south.

If all the Pan-American Conferences had accomplished nothing else than the establishment of the International Bureau of the American Republics, they would have done enough to warrant their being called together. This institution, which is supported by twenty-one independent nations of the western hemisphere, is becoming a powerful international agency, not only for the promotion of commerce and trade, but for the cementing of closer ties of friendship and association. Ever since it was founded sixteen years ago, as a result of the First Pan-American Conference, which assembled in Washington during 1889, and was presided over by James G. Blaine, it has gradually grown in usefulness until now its value and possibilities are acknowledged from the United States to Argentina. The Second Pan-American Conference, which assembled in Mexico in 1901-02, enlarged its scope, while the Third Conference, which gathered in Rio Janeiro in 1906, laid out a most ambitious plan for its work in the future. The action of the last Conference was so closely followed by the great diplomatic journey of the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Elihu Root, and this, in turn, by such an awakening of interest throughout the United States in Latin America, and throughout Latin America in the United States, that now the International Bureau is conducting a correspondence and carrying out a policy that must give it a unique position of prominence and power in the opinion of the world.

When that distinguished philanthropist, Mr. Andrew Carnegie, recently presented the International Bureau with \$750,000 as a New Year's gift with which to construct a new building, he worthily described it as an American Temple of Peace. When President Roosevelt thanked Mr. Carnegie, he remarked that this Bureau should perform a work for the western hemisphere not unlike that of The Hague Institution for all the world. In the correspondence which Secretary Root conducted with Mr. Car-

negie in reference to this gift, he pointed out that a new era was certainly dawning in the relations of the American Republics, which would be characterized by peace, prosperity, and the advancement of mutual interests.

There is nothing whatever antagonistic to the policies of European countries in the policy and plan of the International Bureau. To-day its Monthly Bulletins circulate in large numbers throughout Europe and are found in the legations and consulates of European countries in all parts of the world. European trade publications and newspapers quote from its pages, while the Bureau's correspondence department is continually receiving and answering large numbers of letters of inquiry from Europe about commercial opportunities in Latin America. The Bureau is not bound or expected to assist European interests, but it is too big and broad an institution to show any antagonistic attitude. There is plenty of room in Latin America for the commerce of all the world. The United States has no desire to retard the growth of European trade in her sister Republics, but holds that there is abundance of opportunity for the United States and Europe alike; and, in turn, the United States Government, in the hope of seeing South America reaching out for wider markets in the United States, trusts that she will also build up and extend her trade in Europe as well as in the United States, and thereby bring about a greater prosperity for all concerned.

The United States has never fully appreciated the vast importance and signal success of the visit to South America of its distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Elihu Root. It is beginning now, after nearly a year has passed, to realize that no other Secretary of State in the history of the United States has accomplished so much for the promotion of international friendship as has Mr. Root in this extraordinary tour. He did more for the removal of distrust of the policies of the United States throughout South America and for the upbuilding of mutual confidence and goodwill, than the work of a hundred years of ordinary diplomatic procedure and intercourse. Had he been the President of the United States or of France, the Emperor of Germany, or the King of England, of Spain, or of Italy, he could not have been given a more enthusiastic welcome or been treated with a more magnificent display of cordiality than he, as Secretary of State of the United States, received from one end of South America to

the other. The benefits of his meeting representative South Americans, coming into contact with their statesmen and people, addressing them directly about the purposes of the United States, and studying their political conditions and material resources, will grow with the passing of years and result in that perfect international American comity which should permanently characterize the relations of all the nations of the western hemisphere.

MR. MARKS:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: A prominent Englishman who visited Washington last week noticed that the statues on the squares and in the parks were nearly all those of war heroes. If I read the signs of the times aright, the statues that we will see in Washington during the next generation, the new ones, will be the statues of the Heroes of Peace. (Applause.)

The next speaker represents one of the handmaidens of Peace—education. He is a prominent publisher and eminent citizen of Boston. It gives me pleasure to introduce to you Mr. Edwin Ginn, of Boston. (Applause.)

The International School of Peace

EDWIN GINN.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Before commencing my short speech I wish to state briefly my dissent from the assertions that have been made here that we need large armies and navies, larger and larger, to protect the nations of the earth. (Applause.) We are suffering to-day from a hysteria of fear. Armies and navies have constantly been increasing. Is fear among the nations lessening? I am afraid not. My suggestion would be that we create an international police force to safeguard the nations, rather than increase the capacity of each nation for destroying the other. (Applause.) I would suggest, not a further burden of military power, but that the nations together agree to allow five per cent. of their present armament toward the formation of an international military guard. If this force were found to work harmoniously and effectively, in another three or four years the nations would say: "Let us give *ten* per cent. of our present armament"; and when they came to realize that this force was

sufficient to guard the interests of all, there would be no further need of these immense military forces, and they would naturally fade away.

We have had brought to our attention many times the horrors of war; we know that from the beginning of time until the present moment, the activity and wealth of the nations has been largely employed in the preparation for war and in actual contests. Much of this active warfare is past. What we now have to contend with chiefly is the continuous preparation for war, which is taking a large proportion of the surplus earnings of the world and a large number of able-bodied men from productive employment. A few years ago it was computed that there were 34,000,000 men the world over, either permanently or temporarily under arms, 5,000,000 of whom were constantly employed in this way. The expense attending these preparations for war cannot be estimated at less than two thousand million dollars annually, and the value of the time of these men engaged in warlike pursuits, if employed in productive labor, would amount to another two thousand million dollars. You may say that this burden comes mainly upon the rich. I wish it were so. But from China, Japan and Russia comes the cry of starving millions, victims of this cruel system. If but one-tenth of the money now being spent by Japan and Russia for warlike purposes was expended for food for their hungry subjects, it would not be necessary for them to appeal to outside nations for help.

It is well for us to come together in these conventions to bring home to the people afresh the horrors and waste of war; but if, when they are over, we go to our homes, take up our ordinary vocations and do nothing until another year rolls around, it will be a long time before the present pernicious system will be done away with. The Peace Societies are doing the best they can with the money at their command. Good books are being circulated. Other forces are at work in the right direction. But we are not reaching the people.

I do not find anywhere to-day a stronger arraignment of the present war system than that of Bloch, Sumner, Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Channing, Garrison and others; yet all these efforts have not succeeded in lessening the preparations for war. Never before in the history of the world have the outlays in this direction been so enormous. The nations are straining every

nerve to outstrip each other in their preparations for combat. Frontiers were never so strongly fortified; armies were never so thoroughly equipped; and the navies of the world have doubled their strength in the last fifteen years. A number of the nations about to assemble at The Hague are in doubt as to what extent it would be wise even to discuss the question of the limitation of armaments. England's Dreadnought challenge thrown down to the world has been accepted, and the powers are duplicating this monster battleship. We, ourselves, were among the first to act. Why? Is there any intention on the part of our Government to attack our sister nations? Have they any disposition to attack us? Years ago we prided ourselves on our freedom from the military burdens from which the old world was suffering. Now we are among the foremost in naval expansion. Has this tended either to lessen other nations' fear of us or to make us less anxious for our own safety? Is not the very existence of these large armaments the greatest source of alarm among the nations? They feel kindly disposed towards each other. Why, then, this enormous expenditure? Is it to meet real emergencies or imaginary difficulties? The results of these preparations are by no means imaginary. They are immediate and distressing and need most imperative consideration. We should get at the very roots of this evil.

Is there not a great selfish force at work in these two thousand million dollars of appropriations that we are not reckoning with? The present system means a great deal of business for somebody; there are large contracts to be secured. Is it natural to suppose that the men securing these valuable contracts can be looked to for their curtailment? Or can we expect men in military life, the officers in the army and navy, to recommend a reduction of armaments, when their whole training and chance of promotion is dependent upon such armaments? I do not in the slightest degree wish to reflect on the honesty and integrity of these men. They compare favorably with any class in the community, but I am urging general considerations. It is perfectly natural that this biased element should be active. You all noticed that when the question of building another Dreadnought was before our own Congress, the daily papers were filled with accounts of the activity of Japan, of her military preparation, and of her desire to wrest the Philippines from us. The things that are

happening with us are happening all over the world. Is it safe for any government to depend upon a board of military experts to tell it whether its army or navy shall be increased or not? Ought we not to have as competent experts in favor of Peace as those who believe in war? Ought there not to be in every capital of the world men of great ability to present to their various parliaments the facts upon these war budgets and to oppose in the interest of the people military extravagance?

As a business man I have to look at this question along the lines of business success in other enterprises; and it does seem to me that we are not sufficiently aroused to the importance of the work before us. Have we presented to men of affairs a sufficiently definite proposition to induce them to come forward liberally and help on the great cause? Have we not rather been talking to the galleries? Can any business, or any great work, be conducted on general lines, with no one in particular to look after it? From my experience, not only must there be able and highly-trained persons at the head, but they must give the work constant supervision every day in the year if success is to be attained.

I do not disparage the Peace Societies, but there must be larger and more generous organization. To my mind there is but one way to compete with the militarism of the age. We must unite all the elements that make for Peace in a supreme effort against this terrible scourge. We must make a *business* of educating the people, beginning with the children in the home and in the school. Children should be taught that military parades in holiday dress, the manœuvres of armies and navies to the strains of martial music, do not paint war in its true light. Take them rather to the battlefield of Waterloo, as painted by Victor Hugo; to the retreat of the French army from Moscow. Put before them the horrors in the Russian-Japanese war. Training with muskets in hand should be banished from our schools. Everything that tends to excite a military spirit should be removed from our school books. Especially should our histories dwell less upon the glories of war and much more upon the peaceful industries that minister to the development and upbuilding of the nations. (Applause.) We should employ people whose whole duty it should be to work among the teachers along these lines until every teacher in the land should be an Apostle of Peace. The same method should be pursued with the clergy and with the press. A

bureau of information should be established for the purpose of collecting and distributing to every paper in the land matter bearing vitally on this subject. Statesmen should be aroused to the necessity of bringing their influence to bear much more powerfully in dissuading their governments from these extravagant military preparations. Able financiers should warn bankers that in loaning the nations at these high rates of interest, they are taking the risk of losing in the near future their entire principal. Clubs should be established in every city and town in the land, to work actively for the checking of the war spirit, for the prevention of the present tremendous expenditure for military purposes, and for the election of representatives to carry out their wishes.

For the last five years work along these lines through the press, the schools, and the clergy has been going on in a small way, laying the foundations, as it were, for an *International School of Peace*, although this organization has not been publicly mentioned. Some of the best peace literature extant has been published. Its representatives have attended for several years the great Peace Congresses of the world, and three years ago aided materially in bringing the International Peace Congress to Boston, in making out the program of work, and in raising the funds necessary to its success. The protest against the coming military exposition at Jamestown has attracted wide notice.

If so much has been accomplished with our limited organization and resources, what might we not hope to do if we could secure the counsel of the wisest in planning out a broader educational campaign, and the funds for carrying it on commensurate with the importance of the work in hand? Many an institution has its endowment of ten million dollars, but what institution of the world has so great a work to do as this International School of Peace, established for the purpose of creating among the nations of the earth the friendship and brotherhood of man? (Applause.) We need men and women who first of all are imbued with enthusiasm for the work, believing it to be the greatest on the face of the earth; those who possess the true spirit of the reformer, the spirit which actuated a Luther, a Garrison and Phillips of our own day. It is the personality of the reformer which creates enthusiasm. He brings home to his

hearers the importance of his subject because of his intense earnestness. He knows how to communicate his zeal to others and turn their kindly feelings into action. We need men of that kind and we must make it possible to secure the co-operation of such if we would rid mankind of the greatest misfortune of all the ages.

Finally, this International School of Peace should be built on a foundation strong enough and broad enough to take in all the different organizations for carrying on the world's work, and merge them into one coherent, effective force for the upbuilding of society in every corner of the globe, for the elimination of all the influences that are retarding the productive work of man in his social, intellectual and moral progress, and for the strengthening of the influences that tend to promote good-fellowship and the welfare of all mankind.

Should we not appoint a committee to plan the work of such an organization and secure a proper endowment? This committee should be composed of broad-minded men, the leaders in education and industry, who know how to organize a great work and carry it to a successful issue. Some of these leaders of industry are already keenly alive to the necessary work and are prepared to do their share of it.

Are we expecting a few individuals to do this great work? It is a world's task, and if we wish to see it move on as it should, it must be undertaken by *all*, each one of us taking his full share of responsibility, however great or small. (Applause.)

MR. MARKS:

This meeting will be brought to a glorious close by Mr. William McCarroll, President of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation. I now introduce to you Mr. William McCarroll. (Applause.)

Commercial Organization as a Peace Promoter

WILLIAM MCCARROLL.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: There are two considerations that will prevent a glorious close. The first one is the speaker and the second one is the statement that this meeting would be closed in fifteen minutes by an eloquent speech, for which there is, I believe, just about a minute and a half. (Laughter.)

Ladies and gentlemen, I intend to do it, because veracity is the quality that in this day, by the highest authority, is most to be esteemed. (Laughter and applause.) There is an old proverb which says, as I recall it, that "His words were smoother than butter, but in his heart there was war"; and when the hour for the commissary department is in sight and a speaker gets up to close a meeting with a long speech, I believe that, however smooth might be his words, in the heart of his hearers there would be war (laughter) and in a Peace Meeting that would be very unbecoming. (Laughter.)

The New York Board of Trade and Transportation has for many years taken a deep interest in the movement for International Arbitration and Peace. It has watched and in a measure shared in its development. To-day it joins in the felicitations that are due and appropriate, as this great Congress gathers with representatives from many nations of the earth. Its meeting marks the progress of the movement which itself is a measure of the onward march of Christian civilization.

As we consider this, we find abundant cause for congratulation. It is not without significance to us that this month of April is the sixth anniversary of the first Hague Court, which followed the International Conference of nearly two years earlier, which was attended by one hundred delegates from twenty-six nations. We are now approaching the time of the next meeting in June, at which representatives of all the forty-five nations of the world will be present. In the interim of these gatherings, indeed within the last five years, more than sixty-five national disputes have been settled by arbitration, and within the last three years twenty nations have signed as many general arbitration treaties.

It is eminently fitting, and it seems something in the nature of compensating justice, that commercial organizations, as such, should unite in and actively support this Peace Movement. This is not only because peace is a necessary condition for commerce. Peace may exist without commerce, though that would be the peace of stagnation. But general commerce cannot flourish where peace does not prevail. I say "general" commerce, for it is true, of course, that war produces an unusual commercial demand for munitions and supplies. The claim has sometimes been made that such is an advantageous result of war, but it is at most limited and temporary, and the suggestion is heartless

and brutal. War robs commercial, industrial and agricultural pursuits of men, and means ultimately waste and loss. The result of industrial commerce is growth, permanent gain and prosperity.

It may be lamentably true that almost all of the great modern wars have been chargeable to commercial aggression, or shall I say aggressiveness or greed. Undoubtedly some have been promoted, if not incited, by these. It is not necessary to instance any of these wars, for doubtless they will suggest themselves to you; but this being so, there is, as I have said, a justice in the idea that organizations representing commerce should now unite their efforts in behalf of Peace. We hope, as we believe, that such wars would be impossible to-day, though in our own time we have seen, through strenuous insistence on "the open door" by some nations, conditions brought into sight that were threatening and ominous, but which, fortunately, passed away. It is true that such wars could not occur to-day; that is, in a great degree at least, due to the spread and progress of this agitation for World Peace begun in Boston in 1815 and since consistently followed and urged by our own and other peoples.

That the program of the movement is logical, practical and hopeful, its history up to date gives evidence. At the recent Industrial Peace Conference, held at the home of our honored Chairman, Mr. Carnegie, Dr. Lyman Abbott, in his forceful and eloquent words, well stated the method to be, as I recollect him: "To organize the world, hitherto disorganized, politically and industrially." By this, in brief summary, we understand the object to be the bringing together of the nations of the world, for one thing, through accredited and authorized representatives who shall compose a duly organized body, meeting regularly to confer on such political and industrial questions as concern their relations. This body might in due time lead to an International Parliament, with such powers as could be wisely committed to it for the common good; in the meantime it could promote such congresses as the present by the Peace Societies, and especially through the Hague International Conference, the co-operation of the nations in securing Permanent Peace and the general welfare of their peoples. Surely, a magnificent and noble end!

Of course it is implied and would be understood that underlying such organization, as the basis of full success, there must be, at least on the part of the leaders, a sense of community of

interest, a sentiment of one-world relationship of men. That is best expressed in the higher term of fraternity, toward which, may we not say, we are visibly moving.

Political and industrial bonds may be much of themselves, but they would be weak indeed in the face of provocation, were there not the fraternal desire and spirit which makes for Peace. Commerce is at once a promoter and a beneficiary of this sentiment, which is an outgrowth of the intercourse of peoples. When we speak of commerce, we naturally think of it as a great mechanical movement in exchange of commodities. It is impersonal to our thought; but in analysis we see that there are in it moral and individual aspects and relationships which cannot be lost in the vast aggregate. These count and reach in influence to an extent we cannot measure.

Commerce is the work of persons. Its operations should be conducted by those engaged in them with a moral regard for mutual interests and welfare. If it were so, there would be an end to unjust claims of territory, of concessions or privileges such as have been oftentimes urged to the point of war on weaker nations or their citizens by a stronger. The ties of business would be cemented by respect and friendliness. With the growth and expansion of commerce, the whole world would be bound together by interests far more potent for peace and progress than those of financial investments or considerations, of magnitude however great, though these interests would themselves be the outgrowth of, and cultivated by, commerce. I would not be understood as meaning that commerce is the sole force working to this end; but it is powerful, if not chief. The full fruition, doubtless, will require a long period, but that need not prevent, indeed it should stimulate, our effort to hasten the day devoutly to be wished.

The same principles suggested by what I have said regarding commerce, particularly international commerce, would also be applicable to industrial relations everywhere, and produce a like peace. These principles constitute the spirit of the "organization of the hitherto unorganized world." These are the times of organization. By all means let us have this supreme organism—the body—with this spirit which should vitalize it. Let it grow and develop into fullness of power and beneficence.

There are many phases of this very large subject of the com-

mercial, industrial and agricultural aspects of the Peace Movement, such as their economic and sociological bearings, and we have been interested in the discussion of some of them. But there is only time for me to add a word indicating the important part that may be taken in this movement by commercial and similar organizations, and the method and extent of their influence. This is three-fold. In the first place, it touches the individual members whose attention is attracted by the presentation for consideration of a given subject—let us say this great subject—International Arbitration and Peace. Their interest is aroused. They are stimulated to effort, which, in the second place, reaches out into the connections and operations of such individuals. Each thus becomes a center touching others in turn. In the third place, though not the least important, the organization exerts its influence as a body, according to its importance, on the community and especially on those whose interest or action it aims to secure for its ends, and it thus furthers and carries out its objects. As such a body, the New York Board of Trade and Transportation gives its hearty adherence to the program of this movement as representing the interest of commerce, and beyond and above that, on behalf of the progress of humanity and civilization, through the establishment of peace and good-will among men.

SIXTH SESSION
YOUNG PEOPLE'S MEETING
CARNEGIE HALL

Tuesday Afternoon, April Sixteenth, at 4

DR. WILLIAM H. MAXWELL Presiding

DR. MAXWELL:

In accordance with the time-honored custom of the New York public schools, this meeting will be opened by the reading of a passage of Scripture. These words are found in the book of the Prophet Isaiah:

"And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills: and all nations shall flow unto it.

"And many people shall go and say, 'Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

"And he shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Isaiah 2: 2, 3, 4.

"The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid: and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them.

"They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

Isaiah 11: 6, 9.

From *Strenuous*. Copyright 1947, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

YOUNG PEOPLE'S MEETING, TUESDAY AFTERNOON, APRIL 1948

DR. MAXWELL:

You will all join in singing the Song of Peace, led by the children's chorus.

SONG OF PEACE... M. K. SCHERMERHORN... *A. S. Sullivan*

Forward, all ye faithful,	Children of one Father
Seeking love and peace,	Are the nations all;
Hast'ning on the era	"Children mine, beloved,"
When all strife shall cease.	Each one doth He call;
All the saintly sages,	Be ye not divided,
Lead us in the way,	All one family;
Forward in their footsteps,	One in mind and spirit
Toward that perfect day.	And in charity.

CHORUS:

Forward, all ye faithful,
Seeking love and peace,
Hast'ning on the era
When all strife shall cease.
Raise the voice of triumph,
"Peace on earth, good will"
Angels sang this anthem,
Let us sing it still;
War's foundations quiver
At this song of peace,
Brothers, let us sing it
Till all strife shall cease.

CHORUS: Forward, etc.

Wealth and pow'r shall perish,
Nations rise and wane;
Love of others only
Steadfast will remain;
Hate and Greed can never
'Gainst this love prevail;
It shall stand triumphant
When all else shall fail.

CHORUS: Forward, etc.

CHORUS: Forward, etc.

DR. MAXWELL:

A great Congress has met, a great Congress is now in session in this city, under the presidency of our honored townsman, Mr. Andrew Carnegie. The purpose of this Congress is one of the noblest purposes to which men may devote their thoughts and their energies. It is no less than to devise ways and means by which war and the horrors and desolation of war may disappear from the face of the earth. Those who are managing this great and noble work have judged rightly, that if peace is in the end to triumph over war it must be chiefly through the instrumentality of those who are now in the schools, and their successors, who will soon be called upon to take up their tasks in the world's work. Therefore they have asked you to come here and listen to addresses from eminent men and women and to

carry back to your schools the message which has been delivered, or will be delivered this afternoon.

Before calling upon any of the speakers, I desire to read to you a very brief letter, which was put in my hands just as I was coming upon the platform. It is from a gentleman who I had fondly hoped would be able to come here to speak to you:

"Dear Dr. Maxwell: I have just had handed to me yours of the 12th of April, and nothing would give me more pleasure, but, alas, I am to be at the dedication of the Engineers' Building, of which I am donor, at 3 o'clock, which renders it impossible for me to have the pleasure of speaking to the children; I am very sorry.

Very truly yours,

"ANDREW CARNEGIE."

The first speaker of the afternoon will speak to you on the subject of the Peace Movement and the Arts. Professor Bailey, who will make this address, has devoted his life to art and art instruction. I have the pleasure and honor of introducing to you Professor Bailey.

The Peace Movement and the Arts

PROFESSOR HENRY TURNER BAILEY.

In the realm of the arts man has suffered incalculable and irreparable losses through war. The paths of great military heroes like Sargon, Cambyses, Scipio, Mummius, Titus, Alaric, Attila, Omar, Dandolo, Alva, have always been marked by the destruction of temples, the burning of palaces, the looting of cities, and the annihilation of priceless treasures, precious works of art impossible to reproduce by any means whatever. The beheaded granite Kings of Egypt, the broken horsemen of the Parthenon, the mutilated saints of the shrines of England, cry out forever, like the souls beneath the altar in John's vision, "How long, O Lord, holy and true?" When shall the ravages of war be stayed? "The insatiate tooth of time" alone did not rob us of "the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome"; time did not strip Achaea to adorn Italy, nor plunder Italy to enrich barbarian Gaul, nor burn the Alexandrian library. War did these things. War has reduced the history of art to the history of fragments and wrecks. War has swallowed up all

but a handful of the wonderful works of the artists and craftsmen of a thousand generations, and left us poor indeed.

Lamenting this wholesale destruction, one must not forget that periods of war have often been followed by periods of constructive activity in the arts. The reasons for this are evident. Human nature abhors a vacuum. The people who survive the war must go on living. Desolated cities must be repaired; ruined temples must be restored; lost treasures must be replaced. And in the country of the conqueror there must be triumphal arches, new palaces, new theatres, to celebrate the triumph; medals must be struck, stones must be set up in honor of local heroes.

But what is the quality of such forced art, art produced under the poverty and bitterness of defeat, or upon the order of the victor? Americans need not re-read the history of art to find an answer to this question. All they need to do is to examine the architecture and sculpture produced in the southern part of their own country from 1865 to 1890, and the architecture and sculpture in the form of memorial halls and soldiers' monuments produced in the northern part of their country by the men of that generation. On the one hand they will discover works of necessity only, feeble in design and unadorned; on the other works of supererogation, crude in structure and ugly in decoration, works which even the second generation blushes to call art. "Beauty will not come at the call of a legislature," said Emerson, "nor will it repeat in England or America its history in Greece. It will come, as always, unannounced, and spring up beneath the feet of brave and earnest men . . . in the field and roadside, in the shop and mill."

The incompatibility of war and the arts is symbolized in every decorative representation of Peace ever painted. Under Peace the plough and the spade are plied; the distaff and the shuttle, the needle and the pencil are taken in hand; the potter is at his wheel, the carpenter at his bench, the smith at his forge, the draftsman at his table, the artist at his easel; the mother sings at her work; the children make music in the twilight. The insight of the artist has never failed to make such interpretation of Peace. Artists perceive the truth beneath all its wrappings.

If a war at times has galvanized the arts into semblance of life, Peace has ever breathed into them the very spirit of life itself. Artists have an instinctive dread of war, and the crafts-

men in all ages have fought only under compulsion. The high tides in artistic production, in the age of Pericles, in the age of Augustus, in the period of the high Renaissance, were times of comparative peace. The Elizabethan era in England which gave Shakespeare to the world, and the Victorian era which produced Tennyson and Browning were times when the national mind felt free,—confident of its power to maintain an armed Peace. The last forty years in America, during which the nation has made such strides in wealth and efficiency, and has developed such a consciousness of national existence and potency, have been years of Peace.

But these periods of Peace, and of great activity in the arts, appear in the arts, appear in history like the fitful gleams of intelligence in a mind for the most part crazed with greed and hate. The world has yet to see what the arts may become under perpetual Peace.

Peace fosters the prosperity of the common people. This means an ever-increasing demand for clothing, houses, furniture, carpets, draperies, pottery, silverware, wall-papers, pictures, ornaments, books, musical instruments and equipage of every sort.

Peace fosters the growth of commerce. This means an ever-increasing demand for a perfected machinery for business; printing presses, typewriters, mail systems, telegraphs, telephones, cash carriers, automobiles, railroads, ships, business blocks, subways and the thousand and one labor-saving devices which may be invented, to say nothing of the machinery required by the manufacturers.

Peace fosters the growth of intelligence. This means an ever-increasing demand for tasteful homes, clean cities, accessible parks, good schools, public lecture halls, libraries, gymnasias and baths, museums, picture galleries and noble civic buildings. It means ever better pictures, finer music, more inspiring literature, greater beauty of design in every manufactured object, in short, a perfected environment.

Peace fosters the growth of love. This means an ever-increasing demand for works of art which shall perpetuate the memory of worthy men and women, portraits, tablets, monuments, fountains, statues, halls, chapels and other materials; and an ever-increasing demand for places of worship, temples where every beauty of proportion, structure, texture, color and symbol-

ism shall combine to inspire the soul with a sense of the presence of the One who said, "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect."

The arts have produced some of these things in the past, but they have been for the few, for kings and priests, for the rich and powerful, and for those who might make it possible to have and to hold for a time the good things of life. The arts have never had the chance to produce for the sovereign people. Nor will they have that chance until war shall be no more. With the dawn of Universal Peace the arts will come to their own, and every vision of every artist and every skill of every craftsman will be in perpetual demand.

Hints of the transformations to be made are to be found in the encircling boulevards of Florence, marking the medieval walls, in the smiling gardens of Nuremberg, filling its old mote, in the water fronts of Antwerp and Hamburg, in the river banks of Dresden and Paris, in the park systems of New York and Philadelphia, in the libraries of Boston and Washington, in the cathedrals of Pittsburg and Albany, in the home crofts of Brookline and Montclair and the suburbs of a hundred other American cities. But these are hints only. There is much land to be possessed.

A stupendous amount of good work must be done before all the homes of men shall be "homes of virtue, sense and taste"; before all the paraphernalia of commerce shall be so perfect that one can write "Holiness unto the Lord" even "upon the bells of the horses"; before all the cities of the world shall reflect the image of the New Jerusalem; before all God's children shall be able to "worship Him in the beauty of holiness."

The realization of these ideals is the next Gaul to conquer, the next New World to discover, the next Africa to explore, the next Pole to reach. The arts, under universal peace, will offer to young men of spirit infinite opportunities to win the perpetual gratitude of mankind.

DR. MAXWELL:

The next speaker, who has devoted his life to teaching, is the State Superintendent of Instruction for the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, upon whom his fellow teachers of the United States have conferred the highest honor in their gift, the Presi-

dency of the National Education Association. I have the honor to present to you Dr. Schaeffer.

Teaching Peace Ideals

DR. NATHAN C. SCHAEFFER.

As soon as the average girl begins to study the history of the United States she begins to wish she had been born a boy. Her text-books magnify the achievements of men and devote very little space to the deeds of women. She gradually reaches the conviction that everything great and heroic belongs to the opposite sex, and that life is not worth living unless one can attain military glory.

The boy is apt to form similar ideals from our text-books on history and from our methods of teaching the subject. The names of admirals and generals, the battles they fought and the victories they won, the causes and the effects of war constitute a very large part of the material of instruction. The examination questions which are supposed to emphasize the most important portions of the school curriculum bristle with wars and the things of war. The boy loves power and admires every exhibition of personal and national strength; he admires the heroes whose names are immortalized upon the pages of history; he gradually conceives the notion that the wearing of a uniform, the carrying of a gun or sword, the shedding of blood and the acquisition of military renown are essential to a life worth living.

It seems to me that our text-books, our examinations and our instruction in history should glorify the victories of Peace above the victories of war. In other words, history should be taught from a more rational point of view. Whilst it is not wise to rob the soldier of his just share of glory, while it would be a mistake to minimize the sacrifices which an army or a navy makes in the defense of national rights and in the protection of the down-trodden and the oppressed, it will nevertheless be wise to emphasize the arts of Peace above the art of war, and to teach history in such a way that the pupil will write the name of the poet, the orator, the artist, the inventor, the educator, the jurist and the statesman in as conspicuous a place in the temple

of fame as that occupied by the name of the victorious general or the successful admiral.

At the time when the teacher is instilling proper ideals of heroism and of life the boy can be taught to despise not only the "bully" who is anxious to pick a quarrel with weaker companions, but also the nation that is ever ready to begin a quarrel with weaker nations. He can be taught to distinguish the different kinds of war. There is the war for tribute; no civilized government can afford to exact blood-money under the guise of a war indemnity. The wars for booty, such as the robber barons of the middle ages carried on, are no longer tolerated by the civilized world. War for the gratification of personal ambition, like the wars of Napoleon, is no longer possible. Our country has not always been guiltless of the war for territorial aggrandizement, but this kind of war should be condemned by both teacher and text-book.

More can be said in favor of a war for principle, like our Revolutionary War, and of a war to protect the weak and helpless, but even then it is well to let the pupil see both sides of the dispute, and to point out to him how international disputes may be settled by arbitration as a substitute for war. How well posted we all are upon every war that our people have waged; how little we know of the two hundred and fifty disputes which have been settled by the peaceful method of international arbitration! How familiar we are with the Monroe Doctrine, and how seldom we speak of the arrangement made during Monroe's administration for disarming along our Canadian boundary—an arrangement that has secured Peace between the United States and Great Britain in spite of all the acute disputes which have arisen since the war of 1812.

Patriotism is a virtue, but it may be so taught that the citizen will resort to everything mean and contemptible for the sake of furthering the material interests of his country. Our teaching of history should give rise to a public sentiment that will make it impossible for a ruler or a government to begin war, except for the maintenance of justice, law and order among the great brotherhood of nations, especially among the partially civilized peoples and tribes in distant parts of the globe.

ANGEL OF PEACE.....O. W. HOLMES.....*Keller*

Arranged by F. R. Rix.

Angel of Peace, thou hast wandered too long!
 Spread thy white wings to the sunshine of love;
 Come while our voices are blended in song,
 Fly to our ark like the storm-beaten dove!
 Fly to our ark on the wings of the dove.
 Speed o'er the far-sounding billows of song,
 Crowned with thine olive-leaf garland of love,
 Angel of Peace, thou hast waited too long!

Brothers we meet, on this altar of thine,
 Mingling the gifts we have gathered for thee;
 Sweet with the odors of myrtle and pine,
 Breeze of the prairie and breath of the sea,
 Meadow and mountain and forest and sea.
 Sweet is the fragrance of myrtle and pine,
 Sweeter the incense we offer to thee,
 Brothers once more, 'round this altar of thine!

Angels of Heaven now answer the strain,
 Hark! a new anthem is filling the sky!
 Loud as the storm-wind that tumbles the main,
 Bid the full breath of the organ reply,
 Let the loud tempest of voices reply.
 Roll its long surge like the earth-shaking main!
 Swell the vast song till it mounts to the sky!
 Angels of Heaven re-echo the strain!

DR. MAXWELL:

The next address will be made by a gentleman who has done much to secure the promotion of the Peace Movement in this city. I have the pleasure of presenting Mr. Charles Sprague Smith.

The Kingdom by the Sea

PROFESSOR CHARLES SPRAGUE SMITH.

I am going to speak to you to-day about a kingdom in an age far away, in a land far away. The territory of this kingdom was not very extensive; not much larger, probably, than the territory of our Greater City. The kingdom was protected on three sides by the sea; on the fourth, the land had extended originally in a broad, sweeping plain out of sight. But from

time immemorial it had been accepted as custom, as necessity, that the city and its inhabitants should be protected on that land side, that plain side, until a great portion of the energy of the inhabitants had been spent upon erecting a wall, a huge barrier of earth and stone. It had been built for decades, it had been built for centuries, and with the centuries it had arisen until it stood there shutting out the sunlight, shutting out the day, a high, broad, frowning mountain. Kings came and went, and centuries came and went, until at last a king came to that land, one who had not spent his entire time within the mountain-sheltered city, but had wandered abroad. As he wandered, the thought awoke within him that the strength of a city, the permanence of its civilization, depended quite as much upon the existence of friendship as upon that of hostility between man and man; and so, too, the after-thought that the best thing to which he could devote the energies of his subjects was to remove that mountain which stood there shutting out the day, shutting out the sunlight and thus closing the path to intimate tender relations with those who were living on the other side of the mountain. So he called his old counsellors to him, those who had grown gray in council, and those who had grown gray in war, and he laid his thoughts before them. They said to him: "Sire, we are your servants, and it is our duty and privilege to do as you bid. If, therefore, it is your bidding, we will go about it and remove that mountain which for centuries our ancestors have reared, but we advise your majesty against it. It has not been custom, it has not been so received among us, there is danger in doing it." Some few, indeed, assented to the king's proposal, but the large majority opposed it. And so the king dismissed his counsellors. Old age, he thought, will not dare to enlist in such an enterprise. So I will call the men who have just come to the strength of manhood, my men of middle-age.

He summoned them, and they came from their various pursuits; some from bearing arms, standing as warders of that mountain; others from among the builders, who were ever strengthening its foundations. Gathering them about him, he repeated the same words, and received again essentially the same answer. They said to him, "Our lives have been spent in defending this city and in strengthening its fortifications against out-

siders; we are not accustomed to this thought. Your majesty, we hardly dare undertake that which you counsel, nevertheless, if it be your majesty's will, we will enlist actively in this cause." He dismissed them, and then took counsel with himself and said, "Not even to those who have come to the full maturity of their powers can I turn; their thoughts are firmly directed along certain wonted lines; I must go to the morning of my kingdom where faith and hope still shine with undiminished radiance." And so proclaiming a holiday to all the schools throughout his kingdom, he assembled the children and the youths in his great courtyard—the blossoms, the human spring blossoms of his kingdom.

He was loved by all his people, and in tender, fatherly words he delivered to the children the same message which he had spoken to their grandsires and their sires, and he asked: "Have you faith, have you hope? Do you believe, my children, that we can level that mountain and that we can trust to the growing friendship between those who live beyond that mountain and ourselves? In their schools are children resembling you here, with the same earnestness, the same morning freshness which your upturned faces show." He did not have long to wait for an answer. A little girl in the very front row of the children clapped her hands, and cried, "Sire, Sire, we will be your servants, we will help you to level that mountain." The words of the child were repeated swiftly from group to group, to the outmost circle, and with the clapping of hands and the exultant voices of children, re-echoed by that frowning mountain that had been for centuries shutting out the day and the sunlight, the children resolved that their lives should be spent henceforth in leveling the mountain that separated man from man, preventing close relations, preventing love growing between peoples kindred in blood and near in dwelling.

I am not going to tell you that in a day all was accomplished, but I am going to say to you this, that what had been heaped up in twenty years was leveled in one year, the work of a month undone in a day, for when faith and hope and the full consummation of life that comes with faith and hope set themselves to a task, that task is accomplished with speed and joy. So the word passed quickly beyond the mountain, and the children of the peoples beyond took up the work until the mountain

was leveled, and the material wherewith it had been built was used to fill the swamps and to construct broad highways between people and people. So when those children had come to mature years, not a frowning mountain shut out the day, but broad ways opened leading man to man, and over those ways peace and friendship and all that comes with them passed to and fro.

That is a story of bygone days. But there is also a story of the present. Ours is a land favored above all lands of the earth, protected as none other by nature against hostile force or skill. The thought of Peace has come, is coming fast here—the appeal from the less favored nations to our America to lead the world to Peace. The word is spoken to those passing into older age; to those who are coming to the full maturity of ripened power. In both instances it finds enthusiastic recruits; but it finds also many who hold back. And so it turns to the children. Oh, if the children of America, that nation to which has been given supremely the gift of liberty, the gift of opportunity—if the children of America would to-day join hands from sea to sea and resolve that Peace shall now come to the world, and send forth that message to their brothers and sisters in other nations, by the time you, our children here, had reached your maturity Peace would come to abide. And so it is that in the name of Peace I have ventured to draw up a resolution, and I am going to say to you children that I am very much spoiled as regards resolutions. Whenever I read them down in my working home at the Cooper Union, they are passed unanimously by the audiences, and so I expect them to be passed unanimously here.

This is the resolution:

“We, the representatives of the public and private schools of New York, and delegates from the schools of the country at large, believe that the time has fully come to substitute arbitration for war as the only right method for the settlement of disputes between nations, and that in this work for Peace the children of to-day, the adults of to-morrow, are to do a large, if not the largest part.

“Resolved, that it is the sense of all present that a Children’s Peace League be now formed, and that invitations be sent to the children of other nations to organize similar leagues.”

DR. MAXWELL:

All in favor of passing the resolutions will say "Aye"; those opposed "No." The resolutions are unanimously passed. (Applause.) I shall ask Professor Dutton to read two telegrams which will interest you.

PROFESSOR SAMUEL T. DUTTON:

It will interest the boys and girls who are here to know that this is not only a National Congress but it has become an International Congress by the fact that we have so many here from abroad, and because of the greetings that are coming to us from different countries. I have here several cablegrams which have been received during the last two or three days, but I want to read only two; one from the King of Norway: "I beg you to bring my best greetings to the National Arbitration and Peace Congress whose work, I hope, may promote the great purpose of advocating peaceful settlement of international misunderstandings, a purpose in which the Norwegian people take such lively interest."

And one also from a Southern nation, from the King of Italy: "Cordial thanks for the courtesy of your invitation, with the good news that the Arbitration and Peace Congress by the illustrious benefactors of humanity engaged in it, should be able to bring to pass actively and speedily the realization of their highest ideals." (Applause.)

FESTIVAL HYMN.....*Dudley Buck*

O Peace! on thine upsoaring pinion,
Thro' the world thine onward flight taking,
Teach the nations their turmoil forsaking,
To seek thine eternal dominion.
From the Infinite Father descending,
O come with thine influence tender;
And show us how duly to render,
To Him our glad praise never ending.
O Music! thy source, too, is holy,
Thro' thy pow'r ev'ry heart now uniting;
With thy magic each true soul delighting,
Blessed bond 'twixt the high and the lowly.
Thro' thee, the great Father adoring,
Thy language is known to each nation,
Thro' thee, the vast Hymn of Creation,
From tongues without number outpouring.

O Music! O Peace!
 Happy blending of voices and hearts,
 Of voices and hearts in sweet lays:
 In this union, to God's holy, praise,
 Ever thus your pure influence lending.

Jehovah! thou Sov'reign of nations!
 Sweet Peace to our land Thou hast granted,
 Be Thy praises eternally chanted,
 In Music forevermore!
 Jehovah! thou Sov'reign of nations!
 Sweet Peace to our land Thou hast granted,
 Be Thy praises eternally chanted,
 In Music forevermore.
 Aye! forevermore, aye, forevermore,
 In Music forevermore.
 Amen! Amen! Amen! Amen!

DR. MAXWELL:

The next address will be made by a gentleman whom we all delight to honor, a Senator of France, and a member of the International Board of Arbitration of The Hague, President of the French Branch of the Interparliamentary Union, who comes to us as a representative of a sister Republic on the other side of the Atlantic, the land of Lafayette. (Applause.) I have the honor to present to you Baron d'Estournelles de Constant.

National Understanding

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT.

(First addressing the children in French.)

You ask me to speak English. Is it possible? That isn't nice, you know. It is much more difficult to speak English than French. Then, why do you oblige me to speak English? You could very well listen to me speaking French. Let me tell you very frankly, as a friend of children, I think it is a little selfish to ask me to speak in your own language and refuse my poor French. But suppose that I could not speak English and that you would not speak French, what would be the result of that? With all my good feelings for you, and with all your good feelings for me, if we could not understand each other there would

be an enormous distance between you, dear children, and me, and between all the good people and the good children of my country. I never felt that as I do to-day. If we live each one for himself, and don't take the trouble to learn the language of other countries, what will the result be? The result will be that we will get into a misunderstanding; instead of Peace we will have quarrels; that is very easy to explain. Suppose people tell you that Baron d'Estournelles is a very bad man, that he speaks in French very bad things which you do not understand, then you will be angry with him, and that may be the beginning of a war. (Laughter.)

My dear friends, you are laughing, but I am sorry to say it is generally from that that war begins. It is simply because people do not understand each other. (Applause.) You will understand in perfection when I say that if my children, who are like you children, exactly the same, and they would be so pleased to be here in your presence and to sing with you,—if my children read in the French newspaper that the American children instead of singing of Peace are singing of war, that they are very bad children, very quarrelsome, of course my children will be very sorry; but they will say, we are obliged to go to war with these American children. If you see the same thing in the paper, the American newspaper, about the French children, or the English children, or the German children, of course you will think them very bad, if you do not know; and you may not know because an ocean, a big ocean, separates our two nations. It is easy to have a misunderstanding when people, when children do not understand each other's language.

I remember very well, and can give you a few instances of that. England, you know as well as I do, is not far from France, only one hour across in a boat; still, do you know that the English children used to believe, only ten or twenty years ago, that every young Frenchman lived upon frogs only! When they were speaking of the French boys at school they called them "frog-eaters." (Laughter.) And in France they believed things like that about the English boys, and it was a kind of foolish fashion to think it was not patriotic to learn the language of other nations.

I am thinking of a good instance. I had a very good friend of mine, a very good fellow, an Englishman, who has a little

From Stereograph, Copyright 1907, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

St. Lawrence, de Constant

boy like you—I mean a good little boy—and that little boy when he was only seven years old was able to speak French; although he was an English boy, he was able to speak French like a Frenchman. He was very proud of that, and his father was proud of it, too. I was a friend of his father's; I felt so pleased, too, I said, "He speaks like a Frenchman, and very well." He was living in France, but the time came to send him to school at home, and so they sent him to an English school. This poor, nice little boy began talking in French, thinking all the scholars would be pleased to hear him speak so well—not at all; they found something barbaric in his way of speaking French, because it wasn't the usual English way. They said, "He is speaking French with a French accent." Then the poor little boy was so miserable and thought he could never be happy any more with that bad French accent, so he worked hard for one or two years, and at last he was quite happy—he had forgotten his French. Isn't it a pity, my children, but it is a fact—you know it is a fact—that if you believe the people who do not know, you will learn nothing. When you learn something new, they will try to abuse you; they will say it is quite useless and unpatriotic to learn French. But you must learn French and other languages to travel, to be able to express yourselves, to be able to make yourselves understood everywhere, to try to help others and be helped in case of need. If I had not been able to speak English—if I had not been able to do that—well, what would have been the use of my coming here! I should have been in America, but I should have seen nothing of America. I should have been quite unable to understand anybody, and then I should have to go back to my country in ignorance—not your ignorance, but my own, which would have covered me. I understand that my duty is to understand and to speak English. Well, I cannot tell you how happy I am now that I shall be able to tell my boys and my girls so many fine stories of America.

I will tell them what good boys you are, and what good girls you are, and what a splendid school organization you have. You do not understand that, because you have not compared, but these children's manifestations are something that we do not have in Europe. This is the beginning of a general, not only national, but international education, which will be splendid not only for your country but for the whole world.

I give you my best congratulations and the expression of my deepest gratitude for the noble characters of the great citizens, not only of America but of the world, who have given to you such a fine organization. (Applause.)

My dear children, I can tell you that I should know nothing of this if I had not been able to know through my English what is being done here in America, and what is quite unknown in France. We have spoken a great deal of the American energy, American initiative, but we know nothing about the American family. But I have been able to speak to the children; I have spoken with children in the families of my friends in Pittsburg, Chicago, Washington and in New York, and I must tell you that perhaps the deepest impression made on me during this visit is that I met the family of the President of this great Republic, the children of the President, Theodore Roosevelt. (Applause.) He asked me to come to see them—that was quite unexpected—his children were in the nursery at the time; he came to my room and said, "Come and see the children." I went to see the children, and there I found that those children were as good and nice as my own children—as good as the children in all countries; there is no difference. They were perhaps not very serious; I must say that some of them played tricks even on me. I tell you that one of them offered me so-called sweets in an empty box. Another one of them put in my pocket a guinea-pig. Nevertheless, you know, I found they were exactly like my children, and so I knew about the American family. I made a discovery also about the President of the Republic. Of course his great service to this country is known all over the world, but when I saw him surrounded by all his devoted friends, and by his good family, I knew something still more than the President of the United States, I knew the man; and I can tell you that one of the most respected, one of the best men I have ever met is your President. (Applause.)

My dear little friends, and my dear friends, I tell you that next time when I come I will speak in French and you will have to answer me. (Applause.)

DR. MAXWELL:

The next in order on the program is a salute to the American flag by all the children in the audience. The ceremony

observed will shadow forth the relations that exist between the State and the city on the one hand and the National Government on the other. I shall have to ask all the friends sitting on the front of the platform to vacate their seats during the salute. All the audience will kindly join with us in singing.

(A color guard of boys then appeared upon the stage, with the City, State and National colors. The National flag was saluted by all the public school children present, using the following words:)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE—"I pledge allegiance to my flag and to the Republic for which it stands. One Nation, indivisible, with Liberty and Justice to all."

"Nation with Nation, land with land,
Unarmed shall live as comrades' free."

SONG—"Flag of the Free".....Chorus and Audience

Flag of the free, fairest to see!
Far from the strife and the thunder of war;
Banner so bright with starry light,
Float ever proudly from mountain to shore.
Emblem of freedom, hope to the slave,
Spread thy fair folds but to shield and to save,
While thro' the sky loud rings the cry,
Union and liberty! One evermore!

DR. MAXWELL:

Before introducing the next speaker I wish to call upon the Committee of Arrangements to read a letter received from the Rev. Dr. Edward Everett Hale, possibly the oldest clergyman in active service in the United States.

MISS PIERSON:

Dr. Hale regrets that he cannot be present with us to-day, but has sent this message of love and good-will and hope:

"Please express to the young people my regret that I am prevented from being at their meeting. If I came I should try to say something to remind American boys and girls that we all owe almost all we have to the Union of the States, where every citizen of these

States has the same right as every other citizen. By the time you grow up to be men and women, and take your places in the world—in the United States of the world,—the thousand grievances and difficulties such as your fathers and mothers have suffered will be done away with.

"I remain, very truly yours,

(Signed)

"EDWARD EVERETT HALE."

DR. MAXWELL:

The next address will be upon "Young America and World-Peace." I have the pleasure of introducing Rabbi Stephen S. Wise.

Young America and World-Peace

RABBI STEPHEN S. WISE.

In 1492, in a little town in Germany, there lived a school-master, who, every morning, as he crossed the threshold of his class-room, very reverently bowed before the assembled children. When he was asked the reason for his act, he replied: "Because the young boys now seated before me will in the years to come be the physicians, the lawyers, the priests, the burgomasters, the chancellors of the nation." One of the boys to whom John Trebonius was wont to bow became one of the great figures of history—Martin Luther.

To-day, in the spirit of John Trebonius, we, the teachers and parents of the Republic, by delegates assembled, turn to you young Americans, to you who are the heirs of the ages, to you standing in the foremost files of time, to you who will be the masters of to-morrow as we are the arbiters of to-day. Reverently we bow before you, and, knowing that our hopes will be in vain unless you choose to continue and magnify the work of this hour, we ask you, we adjure you to help the cause of the world's peace, which is the cause of international justice and international right-doing. (Applause.) We, the elders here gathered, will soon be gone, but you, our children, will long survive us. and as we think of our high cause and look upon you, younger

brothers and sisters of Washington, Lincoln, Roosevelt, we are moved to exclaim with the poet:

"For earth's best hopes rest all with thee."

No need to ask you to be true to the flag, for you are American girls and boys. For the same reason, because you are representatives of young America, we expect you to be true to the sacred trust to which you are committed by the word and song of this hour.

To you, the youth of America, we address our appeal, because to-morrow you will be the sovereigns of this democracy which knows no other sovereignty than its citizenship. (Applause.)

You may ask me this afternoon: "What can we young Americans do in behalf of peace? Is not World-Peace merely a dream?" I answer: America, this American democracy, was a dream until your fathers made it real. You ask me: "Can the way leading to Peace be traveled without arduous pioneering?" I answer: "The American is a pioneer by virtue alike of the heritage of his history and his destiny." The Pilgrim Fathers were pioneers. The men who settled Jamestown three hundred years ago were pioneers. Lewis and Clark, who won a continent for their country without shedding one drop of human blood, were pioneers. Young Americans, yours it is to be pioneers in every true and high cause of the world.

You ask me finally: "What can we, Young America, achieve in the cause of Peace?" Let me remind you that this is not the first International Peace Congress held upon American soil. There was another Peace and Arbitration Congress held two years ago at Portsmouth, which ended one of the bloodiest wars in history and brought Peace to two hundred millions of people in Russia and Japan. That Arbitration Congress and that Peace were made possible by the courage and statesmanship of a one-time New York boy—Theodore Roosevelt. (Cries of Hip! Hip! Hurrah! were echoed by the boys in the chorus.)

Again, I say unto you that you can do everything in the cause of Peace. Remember that in this land of ours all the races, all the peoples, all the faiths of the world are being brought together and are being fused into one great and indivisible whole, as if to prove that, if men will but come near enough together

to know one another, whatever their nationality, their race, their religion, hatred and ill-will and prejudice and all uncharitableness are sure to pass away. Herein let America pioneer. Our country seems destined in the Providence of God to be the meeting-place of all the peoples, to be the world's experimental station in brotherhood—all of us learning that other nations are not barbarians, that other races are not inferior, that other faiths are not Godless. War will be and must be as long as we hate the stranger. We are to teach the world that moral, not military, preparedness makes war inevitable, as moral preparedness for Peace makes war impossible. He is no true Christian who harbors hatred of a Jew in his heart. (Applause.) He is no true American who cherishes ill-will toward German or Frenchman or Englishman or Austrian.

I turn to you, teachers of the land, and urge your higher duty. You are not to teach history as if the American Revolution had not yet ended or had ended yesterday. It ended more than one hundred years ago. Instead of execrating King George and Lord North in our classrooms, let us in the great American cities raise monuments in gratitude to Pitt, who in the House of Lords, said: "I contend not for indulgence but for justice to America" (applause), and to Edmund Burke, who thundered at the House of Commons, "I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people." Let us forget with charity the Union's foes across the sea in the days of civil strife, and remember with gratitude John Bright, friend of the Union, and Queen Victoria, our truest friend in the dark years of '61-'65. (Applause.)

I close by reminding you that, after the Battle of Koeniggrätz had been won by the Germans, Bismarck said: "The school-master has conquered." I say to you to-day that the greater conquest of the school-master begins in this hour. The school-master and his pupils have nobly conquered when the Peace of justice and righteousness shall obtain in the world.

Beautiful ever is our flag, but never, never, never has our flag seemed as beautiful as to-day, surrounded by the flags of the nations and bordered by the stainless white of Peace and love and brotherhood. Under the inspiration of this hour, do you,

young America, highly resolve touching the flags of the nations, in the words of Tennyson :

“Our flags together furled,
Henceforward no other strife,
Than which of us most shall help the world,
Which lead the noblest life.”

DR. MAXWELL :

The next address will be “The Struggle for Life and Peace.” I have pleasure in presenting to you Dr. James Walsh, of St. John’s College, Fordham.

The Struggle for Life and Peace

JAMES J. WALSH, M.D.

Unfortunately the idea has become prevalent in modern times that Peace is not a normal condition among living things, but that evolution has been brought about by means of the struggle for life. This idea had been transferred to human affairs, and the strong man has excused his selfishness on the plea that it was but natural for him to conquer others and that in the course of time the weaker must inevitably go to the wall. The principle has even seemed to justify the struggle between bodies of men for supremacy or for territory and to provide opportunities for the stronger nations. Even war was supposed to have some justification on this principle. The struggle for life, however, is not a more potent factor in biology than is mutual aid. The study of mutual aid shows how much has been accomplished by means of it. There is practically never a war to the death between individuals of the same species in biology. On the contrary, they are always found to be helping one another. It is true that when men make them solitary by persecuting them, they lose some of their social instincts, but these exist in profusion among the animals in a state of nature. One needs only to go to Yellowstone Park to see how the animals herd together in communities without interfering with one another, to see even how they play, for play is a characteristic of the animals in a state of nature; to be convinced that the so-called struggle for life, in as far as it refers to individuals of

the same species, is a myth. On the contrary, probably the most interesting phase of modern biology is the study of the social instincts of the animals. Careful observation shows that they are constantly ready to help one another. This is true from the lowest to the highest. The ant because of his social instincts is considered by many conservative scientific students as the creature nearest to man in the exhibition of intelligence. The bee occupies a place only a little lower in the scale because of its similar social qualities. Elephants in the jungle always live together in herds, and it is well known that this is for protective and feeding purposes. All through the animal creation, however, this same thing is found. Fishes in the sea live in schools, and though, perhaps, to youth, school may not seem a good term for the pleasant ways of the wandering groups of fishes, who go where they will or fancy leads, it must not be forgotten that the root of the word school is from a Greek derivative which means leisure. This would eminently accord with the ways of the fishes, and perhaps would hint how knowledge should really be obtained to those who take school too seriously and over-strenuously. All the birds live in flocks, especially when they migrate from one part of the country to another and are more likely to meet enemies on the way. The parrots, wise creatures, have such close communion among themselves that even the old birds are faithfully protected from enemies, and it is said that in their native haunts most parrots die of old age. Wild horses live together in herds; and the domestic cow drifts so naturally into herds as to make it sure that this is a primitive instinct. Our herds of bison on the plains succeeded thus in protecting themselves from enemies as a single animal or even family group could not have done. The herds of animals are always most closely associated at the time of the year when, because of the presence of many young, such protection is needed. Even the seals, though we are not apt to think of them as wise creatures at all, live together in herds. Fierce as are the wolves and ready as they may be to take advantage of one another, they hunt in packs, partly because they have realized that thus they can get their prey better, but partly also because of the feeling that they are thus more readily protected from their enemies.

Shall it be that only man still maintains the principle that might makes right? He is supposed to have reason while the

animals have something less. All the best feelings of man have been taken advantage of in order to force him to war. The unselfishness necessary in a single campaign, if spread over many years, would make a nation happy. Men forget themselves entirely and think only of others and of duty. Think of the opportunities of applying this magnificent forgetfulness of self for the cause that is supposed to be great, to the great cause of humanity itself and its advancement. What progress might we not look for? Let us get rid of the notion, then, that the struggle for life in a species itself ever conduces to development. This is a mistaken notion quite apart from the realities of biological science as founded upon observation.

DR. MAXWELL:

Baron d'Estournelles has a word to say,

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES:

My dear friends, I think now, as you are so unanimous in the impression we have all received on this great day, and which *we* never shall forget, I think we ought to do something—something nice, I mean—no I am not quite right—“*we*” ought not to do it,—“*you*” ought to do it, you little children.

What I propose, with the kind permission of the Chairman, is that as we have been speaking of the children, and of the great son of New York, and the children of President Roosevelt, you should send a telegram, a message of your sympathy to them. I am sure they will be extremely pleased, and touched, and happy to see that you appreciate what their father has done for Peace. (Applause.)

DR. MAXWELL:

All the children of New York who are in favor of sending a message to the children of President Roosevelt will please raise their hands. (Seemingly every child in the hall raised his hand and Chairman Maxwell said “Unanimously carried.”)

The pleasure is now mine to present to you, Señorita Huidobro, recently of Chili, who will tell us about the colossal Monument of Peace on the crest of the Andes.

The Christ of the Andes

How the Great Statue of the Saviour was Set Up as a Peace Memorial Between Chili and Argentina.

SENORITA CAROLINA HUIDOBRO.

"Sooner shall these mountains crumble to dust than Argentines and Chilians break the peace which at the feet of Christ the Redeemer they have sworn to maintain!"

The inauguration of the monument of Christ the Redeemer, on the Cordillera of the Andes—a monument of International Peace (the first in history) between Chili and Argentina—has a grand significance at once political and social.

The colossal statue upon that pinnacle, 14,450 feet above the sea, surrounded by peaks of perpetual snow, dominates the two countries of Argentina and Chili, whose people have been nurtured in the same cradle and whose history is one, though they had been long blinded by foolish antagonisms. Now they can look up the mountain and realize the lesson of Peace, of that supreme law—"Love thy neighbor as thyself." The Divine Master Jesus, the Jew, the personification of concord and love, points out to the two republics their future path, and the love which will make of humanity in the generations to come, one world-wide family, and the whole earth the home of Peace!

In 1898, when an outbreak of the old hostility between the two nations seemed imminent, through the mediation of Queen Victoria peace was restored between Chili and Argentine. For over seventy years there had been constantly recurring disputes relating to the true boundary lines between the two republics. But the people were only half satisfied with the mediation; the feeling of jealousy and hate had not been fully smothered, and it only required a spark to rekindle the old flame. In 1900, the desire to prove to themselves and to the world which was the stronger nation, seemed to have gained ground. Both had prepared for war. Chili and Argentina both had spent millions, and were equipped with the destructive inventions of modern warfare; each nation seemed ready to fly at the other, while the press of both countries, with rare exceptions, was discussing the comparative prowess of the two nations, even going so far as to speculate which had the better fighting chance. About this

time the Argentine Bishop of Anjo, Monseñor Benevente, gave public expression to an idea which caught the hearts of both nations. He spoke for International Peace, and suggested a statue of Christ, to be placed at Puente del Inca, a station on the Transandean railways, 10,000 feet above the sea. Here it could be seen by all travelers. He urged that the countries should settle their ancient quarrels forever, and erect on the snowy borderland "A colossal bronze figure of the Prince of Peace, to record a treaty of Love and Peace, that could be considered as a perpetual obligation, to be transmitted to the generations yet to come." He urged it also as a means of "tempering all ardor for war, and dispelling all prejudices between the Atlantic and the Pacific."

Deep in the hearts of the Chilians this thought took root. The young Argentine sculptor, Señor Mateo Alonso, was selected for the work, and after a time the statue was cast in the Arsenal of Buenos Ayres, from bronze cannon which had been taken at the time Argentina was fighting for her independence against Spain.

The year 1902 was fast coming to a close, and, notwithstanding the signing of two treaties (May 28th and July 11th) regarding the disputed territory of Patagonia, the statue was no nearer leaving its place in the yard of the College of Lacordaire, than if it had never been cast. Meanwhile the foreign diplomats, the church and the women of Chili and Argentina, worked untiringly for the cause of Peace. The press was less bellicose in its attitude, and throughout both lands pulsated the impression of better days coming. Material and economic considerations spoke to the hearts of the men of business. The two nations talked things over, with the result that, in May, 1903, the cruiser *Chacabuco* left Valparaiso, carrying the treaties of peace and the delegates for their consummation.

What pen or tongue can describe the scene which presented itself as, escorted by the whole Argentine fleet, decked to the mizzen with bunting, and joined at Buenos Ayres by 3,000 ships, 1,000 of them steamers in gala' array, the Ship of Peace slowly made its way to the dock, where stood the representatives of the sister nation, ready to extend the hand of welcome. On the 21st of May, 1903, for the first time a Chilian man-of-war was publicly welcomed and made fast to the soil of Argentina. King

Edward had sent his representative, Sir Thomas Holdich, as arbitrator, with full instructions to "make Peace with Honor, if possible to do so." The Chilean and Argentine delegates at the preliminary meeting addressed the King, through Sir Thomas Holdich, in these words:

"In your hands we place ourselves, shutting our eyes to all mean and narrow thoughts, and praying God that we shall open them upon the luminous horizon of an honorable Peace."

Buenos Ayres, from May 21st to June 3d, was a round of entertainments, banquets and fireworks; every one was celebrating, feeling sure that those interested in the fate of the nations would proclaim Peace once more. When the final result of the meeting of the delegates in the Palace of Industries became public, "joy was unconfined."

But something more beautiful was yet to come. It was the inspiration of Señora Angela de Oliviera Cezar de Costa to invite personally President Roca of Argentina, and the delegates and representatives from other countries, to the College of Lacordaire, to inspect the great statue of Christ, which in the merrymaking and tumult of the last few days had been almost forgotten. At the foot of the statue there gathered not only the churchmen and the diplomatists, but the mothers of Argentina.

Señora Costa, in a voice trembling with emotion, asked that this statue of the Christ be placed on the highest accessible pinnacle of the Andes, between the two republics, as a monument of peace between Chilians and Argentines. When the delegates left the college yard the destiny of the great statue was assured.

In February, 1904, steps were taken toward the erection of the monument. The site selected is over 14,000 feet above the sea, on a plateau of twelve acres, on the dividing line between Chili and Argentina and a short distance from Portillo, a station of the Transandean Railway which, when finished, will connect the Atlantic and the Pacific. Señor Mateo Alonzo personally directed the placing of the huge granite blocks which serve as a pedestal. Upon these, early in March, 1904, the statue was placed. The figure itself is twenty-six feet in height. The statue, pedestal and base were carried across the 654 miles by rail to Mendoza, thence 80 miles to La Cuernas, where the huge crates were transferred to gun-carriages, for the journey of many miles over mountain roads. Soldiers and sailors acted as

guard to the precious burden. In many instances, fearing that if left to the mules to draw an accident might happen, these sturdy men took the ropes themselves and drew the heavy carriages over those Andean roads where a false step might mean inevitable death.

On the 13th of March, 1904, both nations participated in the final exercises. Hundreds had encamped on the heights the night before. The Chilian and Argentine representatives arrived early, and found already waiting there the military and naval forces of both countries—the Argentine troops occupying Chilian territory and those of Chili standing upon the soil of Argentina. The triumphant march of these armies through cities and towns had not been marred by sadness or slaughter. The meeting was solemn and affecting. The thunderous roar of cannon was rolled along those great mountains until the echoes were lost in the distance. Between the saluting of guns there arose the swell of martial music, the “dianas” and national hymns of Chili and Argentina. There were loud “vivas” for Chili and Argentina, for the cause of Peace, and for Presidents Roca and Riesco.

This interchange of mutual good-will was followed by a religious ceremonial, offered by Archbishop Espinosa of Argentina, and at 11 o'clock, amid profound silence, the veil was drawn aside, revealing the great statue to the assembled multitude. It was then formally dedicated “to the whole world, that from here a pinnacle of the Andes, it may take a lesson of ‘Peace on earth and good-will to men.’” Eloquent speeches and more music followed, and just before sunset, the Argentine priest, Señor Cabrera, pronounced the prayer and benediction:

“Oh, God, will it that war shall disappear. Put out fires of rivalry, of hate, and cause to reign among men concord and love. Give unto the nations peace, benevolence and order; and to such end let the spirit of evil be broken, let the dew of Thy loving kindness descend upon and penetrate the hearts of men—Thy grace fall upon all men.”

Chili and Argentina have not only created a symbol, they have inculcated into the minds of men for all ages an idea of greater significance than any other in our contemporary age—a

colossal monument to Peace, with the inscription on its granite pedestal:

"Se desplomaran estas montanas antes que
Argentinos and Chilians rompan la paz jurada a
los pies del Christo Redontor—

"Sooner shall these mountains crumble to dust
than Argentines and Chilians break the Peace which
at the feet of Christ the Redeemer they have sworn
to maintain."

On the other side of the base are the words of the angels' song over Bethlehem:

"PEACE ON EARTH, GOOD-WILL TO MEN."

The statue cost about \$100,000 and was paid for by popular subscription, the working classes contributing liberally.

"Only a bit of sentiment by an emotional people," says the skeptic; but it marks not a boast or a dream. It marks an actual achievement. The statue had not been standing one year when Brazil and Bolivia settled the long-standing dispute over the rights to the Acre Territory—Brazil giving back to Bolivia the whole of the Territory, together with \$10,000,000, which Bolivia is spending on railroads. Chili also made up with Bolivia, and by a Treaty of Peace and Friendship put an end to an old feud of twenty-six years standing. Chili is now aiding Bolivia to exploit her wealth by helping her build railroads. Argentina was instrumental in quelling a revolution in Uruguay—and all this, as I have said, in less than a year from the time that lesson came down from the Andean height. Surely, "how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of Him." Let us thank God that whatever the motives which prompted the natives, whatever the incentive which will keep it alive, Argentina and Chili have already, in the beginning of this great century, cast the first vote for Universal Peace! They have surely "ushered in the dawn of the day at whose meridian Peace will become permanent."

DR. MAXWELL:

I will now introduce to you the last speaker of the afternoon, last only because he has asked that he might be. I

promise you that no matter how weary you are you will be glad you have remained to hear him.

He is the representative of that land from which we have inherited our language, from which we have inherited the greater part of our literature, from which we have inherited our common law, and many of our social and political institutions. He is Mr. William T. Stead, the representative of England. (Applause.)

What Young Folks Can Do

MR. W. T. STEAD.

MR. CHAIRMAN, YOUTH OF NEW YORK: You are very tired, I know, and I am afraid many of you regard my appearance here with a sigh of regret (cries of "no" and applause). You are very complimentary, my friends, but I have been a boy myself, and I know what it is. (Applause.) I am glad to meet you here to-night, because I have come to ask for your help. I am like the man of Macedonia in the Gospel, who being seen by the Apostle in a vision, cried, "Come over and help us."

Now, you may think that a strange request from a representative of the old country which your forefathers whipped so well and so deservedly (Applause), more than a hundred years ago, and in so doing, conferred upon us one of the greatest advantages we ever enjoyed at the hands of any nation in the whole of our long experience.

I am glad to meet you here to-day. Every year we celebrate the Fourth of July at my brother's place at Browning Hall in London, as a great British festival. And we always claim, and claim with truth, that George Washington was the best Englishman of the eighteenth century. He was English-born and English-bred, English-educated and English-trained. Thank God you helped him lick George the Third, who brought German feudal despotic ideas into our country. (Applause.)

Now, I want you to help us once more. We don't want you to lick us again (laughter), but we want you to lead us to victory in the fields of Peace. (Applause.)

I confess that I came here rather bowed down and depressed. I had been appealing to an elderly American, one of the best Americans on this great continent; I had been asking

him whether he thought it was not possible for us to get together twelve representative men and women, representative of the best of your countrymen and countrywomen, to lead a great international pilgrimage of Peace, which, starting from your country, would go from capital to capital until it wound up at The Hague, thus opening the way to a practical program of arbitration and progress.

I am sorry to tell you that that old man, old saint, I may almost call him, said: "The idea is splendid. There is no doubt that it would have a magnificent effect, that such a deputation coming from this New World to the Old World would shake the Continent; but you will never be able to get your pilgrims. Americans that have made their mark as international men, Americans that are famous throughout the world, are too busy or too much employed, or too much afraid of ridicule, to undertake such a mission."

I hesitated and my heart sank within me, and I walked down to this Hall, and I saw this magnificent assemblage of youthful Americans, and I heard the Chairman read the sublime words of the Hebrew seer, and my heart gave a great leap of joy, and I felt that an opportunity had come and that I would put before you, young boys and young girls, young men and young women, the story of what you might, what you can and, if God wills, what I hope you will, decide to do this day to aid the cause of Peace, Progress and Humanity. (Applause.)

"A little child shall lead them." I forget how many years ago it was when I stood in the capital, the most beautiful of all the capitals, the glorious city of Paris, so worthily represented here to-day by Baron d'Estournelles de Constant. (Applause.) I witnessed a great international celebration. Your representative was there, and the Foreign Minister of England was there, and the head of the Prussian Government, and there were soldiers there, and all the representatives of the Foreign Powers were gathered there in a great assemblage. And what was the cause of the gathering? It was to celebrate the unveiling of the statue of Lafayette, which the school children of America had given to France. Lafayette served you, and served you well, and you were not ungrateful. But what does that show? It shows that there exists in you boys and girls of America a power; you can make its intent felt upon international relations. You, by

your cents and your quarters, made an impression which vibrated through the European nations.

Now, if you could do that by giving a statue of a War Hero, what can you not do if you determine throughout the whole of this vast Republic to join together your contributions, in order to provide the funds for the carrying out of one of the greatest pilgrimages that the world has ever seen in the interests of Peace and International Brotherhood. (Applause.)

The Hague Conference, you know, is going to meet on the fifteenth of June, and the Hague Conference has to discuss many things; I am not going to tell you all of them, only of two things which I think the Hague Conference will do. One is to protect the world against the dreaded sudden outbreak of war. You know people say there can be no prevention of the sudden outbreak of war, that in the darkness of night, without any declaration, without any attempt to see what could be done to avoid it, it is possible for war to be declared. Perhaps you don't understand it fully, because, fortunately for you, three thousand miles of stormy sea lie between you and your warlike neighbors. But when the frontiers lie as close together as they do in Europe it is a very different story. Frenchmen told me, when I was in Paris last year, that for three months they had expected to wake up in the morning and find German troops in full march upon Paris, and Germans told me the year before that they had long been in suspense, not knowing whether the British fleet would descend on Kiel, burn Kiel and sink all the German ironclads. So you can understand that in Europe the dread of sudden war is a very great one.

Now, there is a New York boy you have been hearing about, Theodore Roosevelt. I am going to tell you about a New York man who, at the last Hague Conference, brought forward a fine plan. He recommended that before any of the Powers drew the sword after they had quarreled, they should call on two friendly Powers to act as mediators, and these two Powers should have thirty days to discuss whether or not Peace could be preserved without war. If that had been acted upon, that recommendation of this New York boy, the honor of England would never have been stained with the disgrace of the war in South Africa, and the war between Russia and Japan would certainly have been postponed, if not altogether prevented.

Now, it is possible, if that recommendation were made obligatory, we might rid the world of the danger of sudden war. But in order to do it, it is necessary that public opinion be awakened. I want you, my friends, to supply the stimulus, and you can do it; I will show you how. You know I have been around all Europe in the last three months, seeing Kings and Queens, and Prime Ministers, Foreign Ministers and Ambassadors, talking with them and discussing what can be done. They all told me this: "We can do something by the work of the Conference, but we can't do very much unless the people are aroused." I asked them how the people could be aroused and they said they had lost heart. When I asked, "Do you think if America took the lead, there would be a movement throughout the Old World?" they replied: "Oh, yes, if America took the lead, then something might be done." I want to know whether you will take the lead and I ask you to decide. (Applause.)

I will tell you in what way I think it is a practicable proposition, and I have discussed this with all the most eminent men in the Old World and I have discussed it with many of the most eminent men in the New World, and they all say it is a magnificent idea, but—ah, that damnable word "but"—"but"—"but." (Laughter.) I say, let us get into action. They say we cannot get the right kind of people; the people whom God has blessed most in this world are too comfortable to go, they have not time enough to go. They have time to go to Europe for months and months to amuse themselves, but they have no time to go and plead for Peace, and to carry the American idea throughout the world. I sometimes feel when I talk to grown-up Americans that faith has died out of their souls, and in place of a heart they have the click of a dollar. I sometimes have talked to Americans who epitomized all that is worst in human nature, who were cankered by too great prosperity, eaten up by the idea that they existed only in order to increase their pile; but I do find the true Americans, thank God, and the true American is before me now, and it is to you that I make my appeal. (Applause.)

Now, you may ask me fairly what I propose to do. I will tell you. The plan is very simple. Let us get twelve of the best Americans you can pick, and let them undertake to go on a pilgrimage to Europe. Now, you say, "Why do you want *them*

to go?" First of all, because I think the best Americans owe most to America, and because I think that you want to get your best men irrespective of party, faith and creed, men who will be ready to stand up and say: "Look here, we are exposing ourselves to ridicule or the risk of ridicule. We know we have to take a month of very precious time, we know we have to show our ignorance of foreign languages; but are we not the sons of those men who under that Star Spangled Banner fought and died?" Are you worthy sons of those great forefathers, if you would not take a little trouble for the sake of the Peace of the world? (Applause.) My friends, this is an important occasion, and I want to say to you quite frankly and squarely that on the question of your response to this appeal and on the opportunity I have of putting this before you now, depends, more than you can realize, the results to be accomplished at the Hague Conference; and when I say that, I am speaking not only my belief, but the unanimous opinion of all the best informed people in Europe.

Now, we want these twelve men and twelve women to be backed up by everybody that is anybody in the United States. We want them to go to President Roosevelt and Secretary Root and say, "We represent the wishes that have been voiced in this great Conference, we represent the aspirations of the American people for Peace." I know that President Roosevelt and Secretary Root will be delighted to have an opportunity to aid in this great work.

From Washington the pilgrims will come to New York, where I am sure you will give them a great send-off as they start on their mission of Peace.

From New York they would sail for Southampton or Liverpool. I had a letter only yesterday from the secretary of the committee over there, in which he said they would be glad to receive your representatives, and have twelve of our best men and our best women ready to join them, and go on the pilgrimage. When they come to London they will be received with all honor; they will go to your Ambassador, who will present them to our Monarch, whose heart is sound and good for all that is beautiful and peaceful. They will see our Ministers, who will hold a great demonstration in which the British and American pilgrims will be joined by Scandinavians, and from

London they will cross over to Paris and there make a stand; and I tell you there is no man whose heart is more responsive to an appeal made in the name of humanity and fraternity than is that of the President of the great French nation. They will be received by the President of the Republic, by the Parisian Municipality; they will be feted, not as conquerors, but as brothers coming with messages of good-will and hope, and with twelve French pilgrims they will go forth to Geneva, and there be joined by twelve pilgrims; from there they will go to Vienna and Buda Pesth, adding twelve to their number in each place; then on to St. Petersburg to meet the Czar and salute the Duma, the first constitutional representative assemblage Russia has had; then turning eastward, they will come to Berlin, and from Berlin to Brussels, and from Brussels to The Hague; and there, in the name of the united international world, they will present their petitions before The Hague delegates.

I come to ask you for your help. I remember that the statue of Lafayette was raised by the school children of America, and I want the whole cost of that pilgrimage to be paid for by the youth of America. "A child shall lead" and a child may pay the bill, and you can do it, you, my friends, not merely those in this hall, but the millions of American youth in whose hearts faith has not died out, if you only bind yourselves together, each under your teacher and your own school, in order to raise the two hundred thousand dollars that is necessary to finance the pilgrimage. With this last word I will sit down.

If it be the will of God, it can be done. I remember in the Middle Ages long ago, Peter the Hermit proclaimed a great pilgrimage and summoned all the children to rally to the defense of the place where Christ had lain. I summon you as did Peter the Hermit, and I ask you to join me. God wills it, God wills it, and God helping, we will do it. (Applause.)

DR. MAXWELL:

Whenever the day and the hour come, I can promise for the children of New York that they will take the lead. (Applause.) Let me in a single word, on behalf of the children of the New York schools, and on behalf of the teachers of the New York schools, and on behalf of the Board of Education of the City of New York, thank the ladies and gentlemen who have spoken

here this afternoon; who have spoken words that have sunk deep into our hearts, and which we shall carry to every school, and to every other teacher and every other pupil in this great city of ours.

After the singing of "America," the audience will be dismissed. I am going to trespass upon your patience, and ask you to sit in your seats and see the Public School children dismissed as they would be dismissed in a Public School. (Dr. Maxwell here gave instructions as to which section should pass out first and which section should pass out last, and which aisles they should use in making their exits.)

Now, as America is never more glorious than when leading in Peace, I ask this audience to sing our old song "America" as it never was sung before.

SEVENTH SESSION
UNIVERSITY MEETING
CARNEGIE HALL

Tuesday Evening, April 16, at 8.15

DR. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER *Presiding*

THE CHAIRMAN:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: This evening has been set apart that the voice of the colleges and universities of the civilized world may be heard.

The participation of the institutions of higher learning in this Congress was inevitable. Of all modern institutions the universities stand first and foremost as responsible representatives of the highest ideals of the people. Their task is, in part by instruction, in part by research and publication, and in part by example, to make manifest the significance of civilization and to extend and uplift it.

Scholarship, science, knowledge are varying names for the instrument with which universities work. Scholarship, science, knowledge are truly international. They know no limitations of speech and no political boundaries can contain or restrain them. They serve to unite and to unify mankind as no other agency or power has ever been able to do. Of necessity, because of their origin in the depths of the spirit and their aim in highest human aspiration, they offer generous and enthusiastic co-operation in the cause which this Congress is called to promote. To exalt righteousness and reason, to bring brute force and passion under the rule of reflective judgment and moral feeling, are the aims of those who band together to advance the cause of arbitration in the settlement of international disputes and the cause of peace between nations, that the standard of living may be elevated, the character of the people refined and exalted, and the knowledge of truth made more widespread and controlling.

Very frequently in these public discussions we hear poor

use made of a noble sentiment. A favorite and striking phrase of those who participate in public discussions on war and peace is, "Infamous the nation which does not make all possible sacrifice for its moral integrity," and that sentiment is made to serve as an excuse, a foundation, for wanton militarism. No man can so interpret that phrase to-day without misinterpreting the feeling of any civilized people for whom he may presume to speak. It is a full generation since the nations of Western Europe, in particular, have stained their hands with war against each other.

At no time in history has economic and industrial progress been so rapid as during this era of peace. Never before has the condition of labor been so much improved, the opportunities for the profitable use of capital so largely multiplied or the influence of education extended with such rapidity and power. Believe me, my friends, with this state of affairs the great mass of the people of Europe, like the great mass of the people of America, are absolutely satisfied. They are rapidly outgrowing, if they have not already outgrown, the barbaric childishness of the era of the duel, whether between individuals or between nations.

Surely, the moral integrity of a nation is shown not by surrender to militarism, but by stern resistance to it. Defense against assault is the privilege and duty of a nation, as it is the privilege and duty of an individual. Defensive armaments are not evidences of militarism. Exaggerated armaments which, by their very existence are an invitation to offensive use, are an evidence of militarism. Infamous, indeed, is the nation which will not sacrifice everything for its moral integrity; but it will find its moral integrity in following the teachings of ethics and the exhortations of reason, and to these teachings and exhortations the universities give constant and emphatic voice.

It is appropriate that the first formal word to be spoken to-night should be said by a representative of that university which is famed wherever English is spoken, and of which Matthew Arnold once said that whatever faults it might have, it has never delivered itself over to the Philistine.

To speak to this great audience in behalf of the ancient University of Oxford I have the honor to present the Principal of Jesus College, Pro-Vice Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and—I take great pleasure in adding—a warm personal friend (applause) Dr. John Rhys.

The Relation of the University to International Good-will

DR. JOHN RHYS.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I introduce myself as coming from the same district as the Great Apostle of Peace, the late Henry Richards, whose name I have heard with great pleasure mentioned more than once in these meetings. As the president has told you, I come as the representative of the University of Oxford.

When I was asked to speak at this great Peace Congress, I felt keenly sorry that the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford could not be here himself, for he could have represented the University far more adequately than his substitute can hope to do. Some of us are so completely of the Old World that we should find your social atmosphere too bracing for us to thrive here, but our Vice-Chancellor is such that, had his lines fallen in pleasant places in the United States, he could not have failed to prosper greatly. He is a man of liberal opinions and business habits like yourselves. He throws his whole energy into the work of the University, and judging from the tenor of his life I should say that his motto is Peace and Progress. With the powerful aid of the statesman whom our University has recently elected to be her Chancellor, we expect to see him inaugurate a period of great academical prosperity. But for all such prosperity and progress, peace, continuous peace, is a *sine qua non*.

Mr. Carnegie, with the thoroughness characteristic of all his doings, including his vast hospitality, has gone into the reckoning of what war means—what loss war means—to the material industries of the leading nations of the world. In this context I wish to emphasize the intellectual industry represented by colleges and universities, a subtle industry which pervades the other industries and makes their prosperity possible in the highest sense of the word. If we take our trained intellects away to guide the destructive work of war, what becomes of the best and highest interests of our material industries? To say the least, they cease to prosper; the flow of new ideas fails to reach them; the artistic element permeating them grows senile and ugly.

I have lived to see and hear of far too many wars. When the Franco-Prussian struggle of 1870 startled the whole of Europe, I was a member of the Sanskrit and Zend classes of Professor Brockhaus at Leipsic, but alas! those classes were broken up suddenly owing to all the native Germans in attendance having to hurry away to the seat of war. Some of them never returned; some came back in the discharge of duties assigned them, and I had a conversation with one or two. They were in the ranks shoulder to shoulder with peasants, weather-beaten and clad in clothes worn threadbare like the rest. They were contented with their lot, it is true, for, as they observed to me, they knew it was impossible for all educated men in the army to be made officers. Nevertheless it was a pitiful sight which impressed me very profoundly, to see the rising philologists of Germany treated as so much food for powder. The most venerable traditions we possess seem to sum up the intellectual acquirements of the human race at the outset as "knowledge of good and evil," but war mostly brings with it knowledge of evil alone, experience of misery and suffering, social cataclysms and the overthrow of orderly life.

Looking at the question of Peace and War in its bearing on University life, I would call your attention for a moment to a movement at Oxford which makes for Peace and Good-will, a movement set on foot by the thoughtfulness and generosity of one of Oxford's most remarkable alumni in modern times, Cecil Rhodes. His benefaction enables each of the States in your great Union to send over to Oxford a number of selected students to go through a part of their academical career on the banks of the Isis. In fact you have already sent us an excellent contingent; they have not failed to show us what they can do. They are all immensely popular in the University, but they are too sensible to be spoiled. What, however, I wish to point out is, that those students will have ample opportunities of making themselves acquainted, among other things, with British peculiarities and British prejudices—the most stubborn of all the facts with which I am acquainted. If the present scheme were to be doubled so as to provide for our sending students over to the American Universities, the exchange would be complete. But I foresee difficulties, arising out of our fears that the British contingent would never come home again, but settle down here to make

money in the United States. Lopsided as you may think the present scheme, it is calculated to work distinctly for Peace and Goodwill. Usually men who thoroughly understand one another are not the readiest to rush at one another's throats at the slightest provocation or no provocation at all. Your young men who come over to Oxford are likely, when they return home, to prove men of capacity and leaders of opinion. One of your greatest authorities in educational matters has shown that far the greater number of your great judges and your great statesmen have been college men. We on the other side of the ocean boast that quite a handsome proportion of those who guide the destinies of the British Empire are men who have received their education at Oxford. To bring these important classes of students in contact with one another while they are preparing themselves for positions of responsibility in their respective countries seems, therefore, an experiment worth making on a large scale. We believe not only that their knowledge of one another would prove to be an influence making for peace, as I have already suggested, but we believe further that peace and friendliness made permanent between America and the British Empire would always go a long way to fortify the reign of peace over the rest of the world. The deep-seated desire of the two great Anglo-Celtic powers to be on thoroughly friendly terms with one another and to act together in the cause of liberty and culture constitutes a fact not easily overlooked by any would-be disturber of the world's peace.

The University of Oxford congratulates herself, accordingly, on contributing something towards the great end which the friends of peace gathered together in this city have in view. Above all she profoundly appreciates the steps which your great Republic has already taken in the way of peace, steps taken under the guidance of your vigorous and warm-hearted President, backed by Carnegie and other men of wealth and wisdom. But in the Old Country it is not the University of Oxford, alone, that sympathizes with you, but all the thinking men and women of the British Isles. My personal feelings I could not better express than in the words of your own poet:

"I greet with a full heart the land of the West,
Whose banner of stars o'er a world is unrolled."

I will say no more; you know what I mean.

DR. BUTLER:

It is appropriate that after hearing the voice of Oxford, we should hear the voice of her sister university, the university of Sir Isaac Newton, of long ago, and the university of the genial and scholarly Jebb of yesterday. I have the honor to present to you the Master of Gonville and Caius, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, Dr. Roberts.

The Christian Ministry and the Peace Movement

REVEREND E. S. ROBERTS

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, AND FELLOW STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES: You have heard from your Chairman that it is appropriate that the representatives of the two ancient universities of England should speak on such an occasion as this. It is also appropriate that the one which does not care to contend whether it is the younger or older university, should speak second. (Laughter.) It has nothing to do with my subject, but I must tell you one little story which reflects credit upon my own college.

My college is named "Gonville and Keys" and usually spelled KEYS, although it is really CAIUS, more particularly and briefly entitled Keys, because it was founded by a man named Dr. Keys. At that time there was a famous Oxford historian named Key, who tried to prove that Oxford was the ancient university and Cambridge was the younger. Dr. Keys in the plural tried to prove exactly the opposite, but the historian of both says that they were equally mendacious, but Dr. Keys was the more reputable. (Laughter and applause.)

But I must come to the subject; the time allotted to my few remarks is limited, and the limitation was imposed at my own request. (Laughter.) I feel it therefore to be necessary to divest my brief address of all superfluity, and proceed without delay to the one very simple proposition which I desire to make. If it is presented in a somewhat crude form, I beg you to accept the explanation that because of the time limit it is shorn of many arguments and illustrations which otherwise might have commended it to you more forcibly. I make the proposition because I claim for it these merits: First, it contains no contentious, pernicious matter—most important in a Peace Congress; second,

it cannot but be productive of good results, even though it touches only at the outer fringe of the most difficult problem of the world's politics; third, it is eminently practicable; and fourth, and most important, it is not advertised as a panacea.

To me, then, some four years ago, the question of the duty of the ministry, of religion, in relation to the abolition of war, presented itself in this form: "Can the ministers of religion, in their public capacity, and by united and organized efforts, make any contribution to the solution of the great problem which has baffled politicians, economists, and statesmen since time began?"

While meditating upon this question, I read in the *Times* of London, of August, 1903, a letter signed by several prominent English clergymen; that letter contained an appeal to the Archbishop and the Bishops, that they should advise their clergy to set aside one Sunday in the year, to be devoted to the subject of abolishing war. The letter recommended a simultaneous delivery in all the churches of sermons in which the leading thought should be the obligation of Christian nations to seek a substitute for that crime of war, in which they have for nineteen centuries despairingly acquiesced. The mere Epicurean observer of human nature, whose gods care not for men, and only haunt the lucid interspace of world and world, may smile at what he may deem the simplicity and innocence of the plan shadowed forth by those undoubtedly honest clergymen. But I recognize in the letter quoted the assertion of a great and valuable principle, which—I speak subject to correction—has been conspicuously absent from any scheme, if there has been a scheme, for a general attack by ministers of the Christian religion upon that mental attitude of civilized nations which regards war as necessary, or in some cases, as a justifiable consequence of conflicting interests. The principle they affirmed is this: the attacks upon the spirit of militarism must be continuous, must be aggressive, must be a part of the persistent plan to be carried out and developed in time of the profoundest Peace, and not alone when we are overtaken and bewildered by the storm and stress of war. I should have liked, if I had had time, to go into that question, to consider the history of the discourses from the pulpit in times of peace. I believe that the result would be found to be very trifling indeed. Therefore, when we consider what answer awaits the question, "Are the ministers of religion doing anything at all toward the abolition of

From Stereograph. Copyright 1897, by Underwood & Underwood, New York

BISHOP HENRY C. POTTER
PRES. NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

PRES. CHARLES W. ELIOT

REV. DR. LYMAN ABBOTT
ARCHBISHOP JOHN M. FARLEY

war?" we may find the beginning of an answer in this assertion of the principle, that the demon of war must be exorcised in time of peace.

Returning again to that letter in the *Times*, I would remark firstly, that it was good but it did not go far enough. I would urge, secondly, that a scheme should be thought out by which not only ministers of all denominations in the kingdom of Great Britain and in all the British Dominions be united for common action, but also, that the common action should extend to all the people who speak the English language; and gigantic efforts be made to induce the churches in all European countries to set apart one and the same Sunday, annually, or oftener, for the advancement of the cause in hand. My belief is that a well-advised treatment of the subject, based, perhaps, upon carefully made suggestions from wise sources, should be delivered as a simultaneous appeal to millions of church-going people, who, after all, are not the least thoughtful people necessarily—upon a certain Sunday. The fact that the sole prominent topic of that day all over the civilized world was the prevention of the barbarous arbitrament of war, could not fail to touch men's minds in the mass, as perhaps no other message could. And the knowledge that in all the churches in all the civilized lands, at the same time, the same appeal was being made to the better instincts of the human race, this knowledge could not but increase, enormously increase, the interest sure to arise.

Let us suppose that previous to 1870, the year that has been alluded to more than once to-night, let us suppose that previous to 1870 there had been a ten years' campaign throughout Christendom; could it have failed to leave in some appreciable measure a sense of solemn responsibility on the minds of statesmen on whose individual action the fate of Empires may depend? A statesman, high in power, can practically impose or repeal taxes, can impede or promote education, can perpetuate or abolish slavery, can establish or disestablish churches, can shake or fortify ancient thrones, and lastly,—it was true a hundred years ago, and it is not held untrue now—he can ordain peace or war. But, with all the churches of Christendom united in one object and not under a thousand points of difference, not only united, but administratively united, we might even hope that in some not distant future war would be impossible. Or, as Mr. Root said yesterday,

it would be unthinkable to find a parallel to the statement made in the *Times* of August, 1903, by a sober critic who wrote thus: "As time goes on and as authentic records will be brought to light, it becomes more clear that not only the great German Chancellor, but almost all the leading statesmen in Berlin, had been for some years working to bring about war between Germany and France."

Ladies and Gentlemen, and Fellow Students, I would not end with a jarring note. If this indictment were true, it was assuredly true of a very few people only, and let me express my personal conviction, even if that indictment was true, as against a few people at that time, it was not and could not be true of all people—and of the German people, for which I have the highest respect and admiration.

DR. BUTLER:

The next speaker I have the honor to present to you is President John H. Finley, of the College of the City of New York.

Soldiers of Peace

PRESIDENT JOHN H. FINLEY

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: If I did not know the views of President Eliot on foot-ball, I should liken myself to a substitute who has suddenly and unexpectedly been called from the spectators' benches, or the side-line, to play the place of center-guard or half-back, in this all-world university foot-ball team under the captainship of President Butler of Columbia University. (Applause.) But, fearing that this figure may be somewhat offensive to both of them, I do not use it. (Laughter.)

I am not going to speak of arbitration or disarmament, for all that I could say and would say would be repetition or reiteration, but I wish to assure you of my admiration for those who have the courage to iterate. You know what Mr. Chesterton says of humanity, "The people of the world are divided into two classes: the bores and the bored, and the bores are the most joyous and the stronger class. They are demi-gods! Nay, they are all gods, for it is only a god who dares iterate. To him every night-fall is new and the last rose as red

as the first." Nor am I going to speak on the economical advantage of Peace in relation to the future of the world. I shall take my less than ten minutes to ask a question: "Is war needed in the curriculum of nations as a discipline of manly virtues?" It seems an academic question. It is one that has been largely discussed of late in another association. It is the one in which the universities and schools are especially interested, because they have the keeping of the ideal of one generation for the next, and the making of its discipline. I read in a newspaper of Sir Robert Ball's lauding of his bare-footed, war-like ancestors, fighting through the ages and bequeathing their intellectual and physical spoils to him. They sent him out traveling among the stars. I hear Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes saying, "War when you are at it"—he uses a longer word than a certain general—"war when you are at it is horrible and dull; it is only when time has passed that you see that its message is divine." Then he adds, "Some teaching of this kind we all need." I hear John Ruskin asserting of war that it is the foundation of all our virtues and faculties, and that men, that nations must have their truth of word and strength of thought in war. But why do these men—this surveyor of the stars, this justice of the highest court of national arbitration, and this peace-practising man of letters and art—praise war? Sir Robert Ball has given his answer, and I will let the Justice of the Supreme Court give his. "There is one thing I do not doubt, and that is that the faith is true and adorable which leads the soldier to throw away his life in obedience to plainly accepted duty in a cause which he little understands, a plan of campaign of which he has no notion, under tactics of which he does not see the use." It is because we find his faith true and adorable that we praise the soldier, that he has been transfigured from a man who is paid, as the word soldier originally meant, into a man of valor, a man with a splendid fearlessness for life.

But is there no other school for that faith, no other cause for its culture than that which makes battle its laboratory and the slaughter of men the test of efficiency? And are nations to learn the true value of words only when they are written in human blood, and cultivate their strength of thought only by devising strategy? I have in mind an incident which General Gordon relates in his reminiscences of the Civil War—a reminiscence of the battle of

Antietam. He tells of a rabbit making its way through a gap in the lines, showing a white flag of truce as he ran. An Irishman seeing it said, "Go it! I wish I was going where you are going." "Yes," said a comrade by his side, "I would be going too, if t'were not for my character." It was that character exhibited in war, but developed in Peace, which made the ratio of courage so high in many of the battles of the Civil War. It was not the greater range of the gun, the better marksmanship, nor any such physical reason, but it was the character of the men on both sides, the North and the South, that made these bloody contests what they were. This suggests the part that universities and schools must take in this great movement for World Peace—to keep the hard discipline that is found in the camp, and on the march; to teach the men to do their duty, even when they do not understand the plan of the campaign or see the use of the tactics; to fix in them a character which cares not for comfort but for conquest; but above all things else to produce in them a spirit which will make them indifferent to their own loss or fortune, or even to life itself, in the devotion to interests which are larger than their own; which will plant in their hearts "the soldier's faith against the doubt of civil life, more besetting and harder to overcome than all the misgivings of the battle-field; which will cause them to love glory more than to wallow in ease."

There is our chance, our best chance to help the cause of internal and international Peace—not by contributing to appropriations for carrying on war, but by intelligence, by a greater industrial skill and individual initiative; by greater willingness to endure hardship as a good soldier, not merely physical hardship, sleeping on the bare ground, or going without food, and shelter, but by holding ourselves to some rigid course of study, some discipline, some high profession, by thinking through the problems of life until we come out upon the boundaries of the known truth. Our task should be in teaching men, not alone how to save life, nor to prolong life, nor to make it more comfortable, but how to lose life nobly. It is the miser of life as well as of wealth whom we hold in contempt. Some time ago I wrote what I called the "Soldier's Recessional," descriptive

of the passing of the great choristers of our Civil War through the narrow arch which hides the everlasting from this life—

Soon, soon will pass the last gray pilgrim through,
Of that thin line in surplices of blue;
Winding as some tired stream asea
Soon, soon will sound upon our listening ears,
His last song's quaver as he disappears
Beyond our answering litany;
And soon the faint antiphonal refrain
Which memory repeats in sweetened strain,
Will come as from some far cloud shore;
Then for a space the hush of unspoke prayer,
And we who've knelt shall rise with heart to dare
The thing in Peace they sang in war.

(Great applause.)

"The song they sang in war," was not merely a love of Union, it was not a hate of slavery, it was not a devotion to any political theory, but it was a readiness to give their lives for something greater than themselves, something beyond their selfish interests, something beyond those dearest to them, something even which they could not understand. God grant that we have not to study again our lesson in such a school, but that Peace, if it come by arbitration, comes not at the price of those virtues which are the most precious possessions of the people who should make the league of Peace—honesty, reverence, fearlessness. We must keep the soldier's valor, and the soldier's readiness to give his life; we must make every student a soldier in these characteristics, but we must teach him to give his life, not by telling him how to take life, but by showing him how to ennoble and enrich life. (Great applause.)

DR. BUTLER:

As the next speaker, I present a fellow citizen whom we are always glad to hear for himself alone. His years of leadership in this community have made his voice always welcome when moral principles are at stake. In addition, he comes to us to-night with his hands filled with credentials. He is not only the leader of the New York Society for Ethical Culture, not only the Professor of Social and Political Ethics in Columbia University, but—as I have the honor of announcing for the first time—by the action

of the Prussian Ministry of Education, the Theodore Roosevelt, Professor-elect, in the University of Berlin for the year 1908-09. I present Dr. Felix Adler.

What Can We Do?

DR. FELIX ADLER

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The point to which I desire to address myself to-night is "What can we do?" Not what can governments do, but what can you and I do to advance the interests of Peace, and especially what is the duty of the universities and of the educated class whom the universities trained? There are those who see the approach of Peace in the near future. There are others, more pessimistic in temperament, who regard the day of Peace as far off. But that question need not concern us to-night. There is a duty laid upon every one of us, in the words of the Scripture, to "Seek Peace and pursue it." It is for us to pursue it steadfastly, no matter when the goal will be attained.

And more particularly I would speak of what those should do who have had the advantage of a university education. I believe that university men have a special function. They are citizens, like the rest, but they have a special function in the matter of citizenship and in regard to the Peace of the world.

The presence on this platform of the distinguished men who represent the ancient universities of Oxford and Cambridge, has led my thoughts back for a moment to the origin of the great universities, and I stop to ask myself: What was it that called them into being? What was the purpose which they served at their origin? Reflection and reading have led me to believe that all institutions are, as it were, stamped at their origin, and that the purpose imprinted upon them in the moment of their birth is never wholly lost, and that they can never wholly depart from it. Now, to serve what purpose did these great universities spring into being? They came into being in response to a social need. They were not founded, they grew; and they grew in response to a great social need, a need that has since been often forgotten, but that can never be permanently obscured. They came in response to the need of finding intellectual supports for the highest and deepest faiths of mankind. Unfortunately, at

that time the faith was conceived of too rigidly. It stood like a rigid wall, which the play of intellect could not affect. And so it came to pass that the intellect, wearying of its effort, recoiled upon itself. And the universities restricted themselves more or less to the promotion of utilities and the training of the intellectual faculties. But the university of the future will resume the purpose for which it came into life, and of all the faiths for which it will seek to supply intellectual supports, none is more important than the faith that good in the end will triumph over evil, sanity over madness, civilization over barbarism, and that Peace will replace War.

Let me briefly mention two ways in which you, my fellow students, you the men and women of our colleges and universities, can be the sustainers and promoters of Peace. In the first place the university students and graduates ought above all others to stand for sober second thought in times of popular excitement. When the storm is abroad, when the multitude rages like a weltering sea, when every safeguard threatens to be swept away, then it is the special duty of those who have learned deliberation, who have been trained in the higher institutions of learning, to stand for deliberation. In monarchical countries there are barriers outside the people. The will of the monarch is such a barrier against popular passion. In a democracy there can be no barriers outside the people, the barriers must all be within the people. The graduates of universities should form a barrier against popular passion.

There are two phrases one often hears, "Public sentiment," "Public opinion." For my part I am satisfied with neither of them. Sentiment is fluctuating; opinion, as Plato long ago told us, is capricious. There is something better than public sentiment and public opinion, namely, public reason. It is public reason for which the educated classes ought, above all others, to stand. By checking popular frenzies they can help the cause of Peace.

Secondly, they can be of immense service by counteracting one of the principal causes of war, namely, the antipathy which is so generally felt against whatever is alien and strange. In early times the stranger was *ipso facto* the enemy, and even at the present day war is often due to the sheer misunderstanding and mistrust of aliens.

And, on the contrary, nothing is nobler in culture than the complete transformation which it works in this sentiment. The cultivated man is one who realizes that the type of civilization represented by foreign countries is a necessary complement to the type of civilization represented by his own country. He is one who strives to appropriate and assimilate whatever is excellent in the life, the thought, the ideals of strangers. Culture makes for Peace; and universities, so far as they stand for culture, make for Peace. The cultivated man is one who is able truly to say, *Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto.*

And now, in closing, permit me one additional word. I have often speculated—who has not?—on the subject of what is called earthly immortality. There have been various pleasing ways in which men have been immortalized, so to speak, in this earthly fashion. Some men's names linger on in flowers, as for instance that of Linnaeus, the celebrated botanist, in the delicate and fragrant linnaea. The names of others have been attached to trees, like the famous Cherokee chief, whose name lasts on in the stately Sequoia. Others are perpetuated by attaching their names to great thoroughfares, like the "Goethe Strasse" the "Rue Voltaire." Others perpetuated their names by inscribing them over the portals of the philanthropic institutions which they have founded. But, if I may be permitted to say so, there is a finer, a more spiritual way than this, and that is to be willing that the name shall be obliterated, not to desire that it shall continue to be mentioned; to sink the private self in some objective good, like the anonymous builders of the great cathedrals, whose names indeed are forgotten, but who continue to live in the beauty and perfection of the edifices which they reared. (Applause.) At The Hague there will be a Temple of Peace, and that is well. But it can but be the symbol and token of another Temple of Peace "not builded by hands," to which each one of us can contribute his building stone; a temple whose world-wide dome and shining arches will one day gather beneath them a sanctified and ennobled humanity. That temple is as yet a mere vision; but surely the day will dawn, however dark the clouds that obscure its dawning, when the vision will come true. And blessed are we if we are contributors in the least to bring it nearer. In that day no one will hurt another any more, and no one will wound another any more;

for they shall all speak one language, the language of simple friendliness and truth. (Applause.)

DR. BUTLER:

A recent book entitled "The Newer Ideals of Peace," which touches with skill, learning, and high feeling upon the problems of our time, had for its author the next speaker. Already she has been taxed by the demand of the overflow meeting, made up of hundreds of persons unable to gain admission to this hall. I take great pleasure in presenting as the next speaker a woman who is a whole college in herself—Miss Jane Addams, of Hull House, Chicago.

The New Internationalism

MISS JANE ADDAMS

This great Peace Conference convened here was called, not merely that we might talk together and prognosticate concerning the fine things which will take place at the next Hague Conference, but largely that we might take stock of our assets, and formulate the new hopes upon which we venture to predict the final coming of Peace.

I take it that I was asked to speak this evening upon "The New Internationalism," not that I might state the internationalism of the scholar which has been so ably set before you, for in all times the scholar has lived in "the kingdom of the mind," and has known no national bounds; nor yet that I might speak of such international congresses as those which meet to consider questions of universal postal service and sanitary science, which also belongs to that higher kingdom; but rather that I might bring news of those humbler people, who have hitherto failed to enter this "kingdom of the mind" because of that traditional attitude towards aliens which Dr. Adler has mentioned. The serf tied to the soil believed that the people on the other side of the mountain had horns and claws; the peasant who never ventured from his home was assured that he would be killed in his neighbor's fields, although they were as fertile and sunny as his own. Only now, during the last one hundred years, are we able to say that the peasant peoples of the earth, the hewers of wood and the drawers of water, have at last come into a larger cosmopolitanism

founded upon community of interests and knowledge. For the first time in the history of the world these humbler people have been able to undertake peaceful travel—to cross mountains and seas. An Italian neighbor of mine can come from Naples to Chicago for twenty-two dollars, and he can go back from Chicago to Naples for eighteen dollars, and he often does go back to save his winter's coal bill. It is now for the first time that millions of people throughout the earth have been able to read together. We do not realize how short a term of years it is since this same trick of reading has been spread over the face of the nations. We all read practically the same news every morning. We may accuse our newspapers of lack of accuracy in the reports they make, we may accuse them of lack of perception in that they do not print the significant things as they occur over the face of the earth, but certainly we cannot accuse them of lack of enterprise in pushing their circulations. (Laughter.) As a result of this untiring enterprise, thousands of people are brought together each day into a new common kingdom of the mind; it may be narrow, it may concern only the trivial things of life, the sensations of murder and sudden death, but at least for a few minutes after breakfast each morning millions of men come together and consider those events which are of international report. What is happening from this new bringing together of the peoples of the earth? Some of us who live in cosmopolitan neighborhoods are convinced, although I am sure that you would soon learn it for yourselves if you were subjected to the same environment—that at this moment there is arising in these cosmopolitan centers a sturdy, a virile and an unprecedented internationalism which is fast becoming too real, too profound, too widespread, ever to lend itself to warfare. The rulers who have hitherto urged warfare because of their dynastic ambitions or their religious differences or their imperialistic vanities, or anything else you please, have always been obliged to dress these motives in fine phrases before they could inscribe them on the banners of the multitude; and these same rulers, before they could induce even their own people to follow them, have been forced to portray the enemy as hideous or wicked or barbaric or "weak." At the present moment, however, if the people who have entered into this new internationalism are to be led into warfare, they must be led against their next-door neighbors; and if they cannot tear themselves apart

from each other long enough to get the alien point of view, then it is impossible for them to obtain the point of view necessary for the soldier, and ambitious rulers will appeal and command in vain.

Ruskin has been quoted here just now to tell us that war alone preserves the sense of detachment, the willingness to sacrifice life for higher aims which the soldier's career has engendered; and yet it is Ruskin who reminds us that we admire the soldier, not because he goes forth to slay, but because he goes forth ready to be slain. When we get down to the real essence of war, whenever we try to find out what it is which we actually admire—that which has made men extol war through many generations—we suddenly discover that it is this high carelessness concerning life, that it is the spirit of the martyr who sets his faith above his life. So I believe that when we once apprehend the international goodwill which is gathering in the depths of the cosmopolitan peoples, that we will there discover a reservoir of that moral devotion which has fostered "the cause of the people," so similar in every nation, throughout all the crises in the world's history. All that we need to do for the healing of the nations is to provide channels through which its beneficent waters may flow. If this devotion to unselfish aims were given its ritual, or, if you please, its paraphernalia, the beat of its own drums; if it were made such a spectacle as men like to see and have a right to see, then I believe that we would be in no danger of losing the value of the war virtues, and that we would find their substitutes in a new cosmopolitanism which is developing in the life of the common people. It is too precious a moral asset to be longer overlooked.

It is in some such hope as this, in the desire to make it valid and tangible, to receive new assurance of its power, that some of us have come to this Peace Congress. It is needless to say that it is hard to formulate it; that although this power of devotion to the human cause is no mean force, it is difficult to put it over against the pomp of war. Yet it is growing and developing in this America of ours as it is nowhere else, because nowhere else does it have the same opportunity. Unless we recognize it, unless we lead it forth and give it the courageous expression which it deserves, we will be thrown back into the old ideals of warfare, which we ought to give up, not because they are old, but because they do not fit the present moment. It is needless to say

that it is always dangerous to be forced to abandon old ideals and emotions without any new ones which may be substituted for them.

If any of you feel as a result of this Peace Congress that admiration for warfare is slipping out of your grasp, and as if, for the moment, you have no hero whom you may whole-heartedly admire, permit me to suggest that new admirations too large for national bounds are developing in the life of a cosmopolitan people, that a gigantic hero is awakening there—turning in his sleep as it were. When this hero is wide awake and has come into his own, it is quite possible that we will be moved to give him, not the traditional laurel wreath of the soldier, but the martyr's crown. It is also possible that in the moment of decorating this hero of the new internationalism, we may discover that we had hitherto admired the soldier only because he too had represented the spirit of the martyr, and had ever been ready to place his life at the service of a great cause.

DR. BUTLER:

Before presenting the next and last speaker, I wish, on behalf of the committee, and I am sure I may add on behalf of this audience as well, to tender to the members of the College Glee Clubs our cordial and hearty thanks. (Applause.)

At the conclusion of the next speech, the Glee Club will lead the audience in the singing of "America." I take pleasure in presenting Mr. Edwin D. Mead, of Boston, whose voice and soul have been given to this cause for a full generation.

What the Scholar has Done for Peace

EDWIN D. MEAD

Emerson once said: "The Americans have little faith. They rely on the power of a dollar; they are dead to a sentiment; and no class more faithless than the scholars or intellectual men." Emerson had very strong provocation at the time he spoke. I think neither judgment can stand as a general proposition. But let them stand as the expression of his scorn, and our own, for the faithless American and the faithless scholar. America, the land of great privilege and great opportunity, is pre-eminently

bound to be the land of idealism; the scholar who is deaf to noble sentiment is above all men reprobate.

On the whole, I believe that no class of men have been so faithful and so heroic as the world's scholars. It would be a terrible impeachment if it were not so—if knowledge did not make for virtue and for leadership. Faithless and selfish, scholars have been often enough, but from the time when Moses, learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, led Israel up out of Egypt, and Paul, who had sat at the feet of Gamaliel, preached Christ, and Wyclif and Luther and Melancthon and Calvin and their fellow-workers, greatest scholars of their time, preached the Reformation, to the time when Sir John Eliot and Hampden and Pym and Cromwell and Milton and Vane, Oxford and Cambridge scholars all, led the movement which brought in the English Commonwealth, when scholars of Harvard and William and Mary—Otis, Adams, Hancock, Jefferson, Marshall—with Madison of Princeton and Hamilton and Jay of Columbia here—were leaders in the struggle for American independence and in the creation of this American republic, and when Sumner and Phillips and Channing and Parker and Emerson and Lowell fought to redeem the land from slavery—I say in all these ages scholars, whatever selfishness and recreancy in their class, have been leaders and heroes. I make no foolish claim, young ladies and gentlemen—for to you especially I speak—for your privileged class. None of us ever forgets that Washington and Franklin, greatest of the founders of the republic, that Garrison and Lincoln, pre-eminent in the anti-slavery struggle, were not trained in college halls; and especially I would not have you forget that the leaders in both great struggles, like the leaders in all great struggles, over and over, found the great class of privileged and cultivated men ranged like flint against them, and the "plain people" their support. Learn history just as it is, and see what poor creatures the scholars of the past who closed their eyes to the call of the future, appear to the generation after them, and see the world's gratitude and obligation to her long line of scholars who had faith and faithfulness.

If there were a greater scholar in his time than Hugo Grotius, living in Holland at the very time that our fathers were in exile there, it would be hard to name him. It would be hard to

name a nobler soul. Himself presently in exile, he wrote there his "Rights of War and Peace," that great work of which our most eminent international man, Andrew D. White, has well said that no other work not claiming divine inspiration has ever rendered equal service to mankind. With that book international law was born almost full-grown. Consider its two achievements. Our great soldier said—or did not say—that "war is hell"; but there are degrees in hell—and the hell of war to-day is, in point of barbarity, mild compared with that at the time of Grotius's powerful impeachment. Since he spoke, too, how has the sentiment in behalf of arbitration and the reasonable settlement of international quarrels steadily grown! Of all men in human history, no other has exerted an influence so profound in behalf of the peace and order of the world as this laborious and consecrated scholar, who sleeps there in the same old church at Delft where William the Silent sleeps—the principal decorations of his monument that silver wreath placed there by our American government.

Grotius stood for peace; William the Silent stood for freedom; both stood for justice. Who was it that, in showing the indissoluble dependence of universal peace upon free government and the reign of law, stated the true philosophy of the movement in whose interest we are gathered here, more profoundly than it had ever then been stated for the modern world? It was Immanuel Kant, greatest of modern philosophers and most illustrious scholar of his time. Learn his "Eternal Peace," young ladies and gentlemen, by heart. Bind it together with Dante's "Monarchia," that inspired dream of a united world, which antedated Kant's "Eternal Peace" by half a millennium.

It is because poets and scholars have had visions that you and I now have a program. It is because there have been Peace prophecy and Peace gospel and Peace philosophy, doing their leavening work through the long years, that at last there is a Peace party, and the war against war is taken up by statesmen as a thing of practical politics, just as the war against slavery was. If the world's scholars now do their duty, Christendom is going to be freed from war in the lifetime of some of you, just as this republic was freed from slavery in the lifetime of many of us still not old.

I say we have got beyond the stage of protest, beyond being a movement, and are a party, with a program and a platform. We are knocking at the door of a World Parliament, just assembling, and uniting with the 2,500 members of the different national parliaments, hard-headed men of affairs, who constitute the Inter-parliamentary Union, in demanding the adoption of five sweeping measures: first, that this Parliament provide for its own periodical and regular sessions, providing thus at a stroke a true Parliament of Man; then, that it frame and the nations ratify a general arbitration treaty; that it provide for the limitation and then the gradual proportionate reduction of the burdensome armaments of the nations; that it declare for the immunity of all unoffending private property at sea in time of war; and, finally, that every contested issue between two nations, not settled by diplomacy or arbitration, shall be referred to an impartial commission for investigation and report, before any hostilities or declaration of war. With such investigation and report, the cool reason of the nations and the public opinion of the world can be depended on to make a war impossible.

If the scholars of America, the men who share public opinion, do their duty, every one of those measures will be embodied in a Hague convention before our next college year opens in September. American public opinion is able in this thing to tip the balance.

What is this coming Hague Conference, with its representatives from forty-six nations, but that very Parliament of Man of which Tennyson sang, realized here under our eyes? What have American scholars done to make possible this general arbitration which the world now demands? Samuel Adams, of Harvard College, the "Father of the American Revolution," prepared a memorial to Congress from Massachusetts, almost as soon as the Revolution was over, urging Congress to take steps in co-operation with all nations with which we had treaties, to provide a more rational means than war to settle international differences. John Jay of New York signed the first arbitration treaty. His son, Judge William Jay, for years the president of the American Peace Society, was the great spokesman of his time for arbitration; and his arbitration plan was the principal practical theme considered at the first International Peace Conference at London in 1843.

President Eliot has been newly reminding the United States and Canada that the "self-denying ordinance," as he well calls it, by which after the war of 1812 they determined, instead of maintaining two great naval squadrons on the Great Lakes and a line of forts all along the boundary, that they would have nothing of the sort, has pointed the true way for the reduction of armaments and eventual disarmament among all nations. What has been the result of this decision of the United States and Canada to act like gentlemen instead of like cowboys? If they had kept up their forts and frigates, their garrisons and marines, there would probably have been friction a score of times, and there might have been war; without them, there has been Peace, security, and mutual respect. It pays for nations, as well as men, to act like gentlemen. A community of men with pistols in their pockets is not safer, and certainly not braver, than one without. The pistol is a sign of fear, not of courage, and it provokes hostility instead of averting it. Well, cannon and cruisers are nothing but big pistols; and nations that parade them as their chief dependence and chief pride, are really still in the cowboy stage—as Emerson told us in his pregnant way fifty years ago. It is a terrible mistake to think a bully with a pistol braver than a gentleman without one; he is simply less civilized. When the nations really become brave and trustful, instead of fearful, they will simply have their international police and courts, and sport cannon no more than gentlemen in Fifth Avenue sport pistols. Now, who was it that taught the United States and Canada a century ago to act like gentlemen and so be safe? It was two or three American scholars, acting in a very simple and quiet way.

I think of another prophetic thing to which the United States was a party, bearing upon another of the five points of our platform. The other party to it besides the United States was Germany. For the first time in many years, the International Peace Congress meets this year in Germany—at Munich, the last of August, I think. I hope we shall send a great American delegation—that every American professor and American scholar in Europe this summer will plan to be at Munich then, to express America's friendship for the great German nation, and the peculiar obligation of thousands of our scholars to the German universities. And I hope that somebody there will recall the fact

that the last official act of Benjamin Franklin in Europe was to sign a treaty with the King of Prussia, then Frederick the Great, which provided that in case of war between the two nations, the private property of the citizens of the nations should not be disturbed. If the United States and Canada have taught the world a lesson in disarmament, the United States and Prussia taught it a lesson in fundamental international civilization on the sea. You who read Franklin know how long this idea lay close to his heart; and Franklin, young ladies and gentlemen, I call a scholar, a much better one than most of the bachelors of arts. The author of our Declaration of Independence, the founder of the University of Virginia—and by his inspiration of Ann Arbor, also, and a score of similar State universities—was a scholar; and in this day when the Chinese boycott is teaching us its drastic lesson, it is profitable to study again Jefferson's teaching of the superiority of commerce to guns as a mere instrument of coercion, when coercion becomes necessary.

But the time would fail to tell what scholars have done for the cause of international reason and justice which brings us together. And the question is, what are American scholars going to do for the cause at this supreme juncture?

The most impressive episode, in many ways, of the week of the International Peace Congress in Boston in 1904, was the visit of the foreign delegates to Mount Auburn, that most sacred Poets' Corner of ours, to lay wreaths upon the graves of the seven great Apostles of Peace who are buried there.

One of the seven was Charles Sumner, greatest scholar in the Senate in his time, who began his public life not in the war against slavery, but in the war against war, which throughout his life he regarded, as did Garrison himself, as the more important war of the two. His oration on the "True Grandeur of Nations" and his later peace address constitute, to my thinking, the most powerful impeachment of the war system to be found in the libraries. When Sumner made his will, he bequeathed to Harvard University \$1,000 to provide annual prizes for the best essays on rational methods of settling international differences, to supplant the method of war. I wish that we might see in every college and university in the land liberal provisions for attention, by essays and lectures and debates, to international relations and

duties. I rejoice in the movement inaugurated at Mohonk, through the initiative of ex-President Gilman of Johns Hopkins University, to this very end. Sumner's soul is marching on.

Sumner once said that the greatest service which the Springfield Arsenal ever rendered America was in inspiring Longfellow's sublime poem on the unworthiness of arsenals altogether in a so-called Christian civilization. Longfellow wrote the poem after he and Sumner had visited the arsenal together. It was an appeal for right teaching.

"Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts."

Longfellow also was one of the seven Apostles of Peace upon whose graves our European friends laid their wreaths. Another was Lowell, who, as you remember well, once wrote:

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new messiah, offers each the bloom or
blight,
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that
light."

The commanding cause of our time is the war against war. The question in our present crisis is, what shall America do, what shall the men of thought and knowledge who shape American public opinion do, for the World's Peace and better organization at this hour? The young scholar now entering active life enters it in the most pregnant and momentous time in modern history. China, with a quarter of the population of the globe, is waking up and facing America. Russia is stretching out her hands to God and to liberty-loving men. We are just realizing that there is a South America. We are waking to the wrongs and the rights of poor men, the toiling millions, whom wars and armaments are robbing. And, alas, we are strongly feeling the temptation, in our eagle's flight, of the hoary old military ways and vanities of the past. The question of the present crisis to the American scholar is, Shall the republic be true to the principles of its founders; shall it realize the dreams of its prophets of Peace?

From Stereograph. Copyright 1907, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

HON. NAHUM J. BACHELDER

HON. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

HON. JOHN BARRETT

SAMUEL GOMPERS

WILLIAM MCCARROLL

EIGHTH SESSION

ORGANIZED LABOR IN RELATION TO THE PEACE MOVEMENT

COOPER UNION

Tuesday Evening, April Sixteenth, at 8.15

MR. JOSEPH R. BUCHANAN Presiding

MR. CHARLES SPRAGUE SMITH:

I am sorry to have to announce that Mr. Duncan, who was expected to preside this evening, sent a telegram at the last moment saying that on account of conditions that had arisen in his trade, it was not possible for him to be present, so that the presiding officer to-night will be Mr. Joseph R. Buchanan, the Chairman of the Local Committee.

MR. BUCHANAN:

This meeting has been arranged by the Local Committee of labor men in conjunction with the People's Institute. It is intended as a labor session of the National Arbitration and Peace Congress now holding sessions in this city.

In considering the substitution of arbitration for war as a means of settlement of disputes between nations, it appears to us peculiarly appropriate that the voice of labor should be heard. Upon the workers fall the heaviest cost and the greatest burdens, which wait upon and follow war. From their ranks come those whose bodies stop the bullets from either side in battle, and upon their backs are cast the burdens which war leaves behind. Therefore, I say, we consider it peculiarly appropriate in the discussion of this question that labor should give expression to its views.

When the time comes, and God hasten the day, that the workers of the world shall be united in a universal brotherhood, and that brotherhood shall declare that no more will the workers of one land take up arms at the command of some mercenary or

revengeful ruler (applause) against the workers of some other land, then, my friends, war will cease (applause), for, while they may declare war, there will be none left to fight its battles. (Applause.)

I am very sorry that it was necessary to make this substitution of myself for Mr. Duncan as Chairman of this meeting; and I am very sorry to say that some difficulties in organizations throughout the country have prevented the attendance of others of the American Federation of Labor whom we expected here this evening. However, we have not placed all our eggs in one basket, and I am satisfied that you will be entertained, edified and instructed by those who will speak to you from this platform to-night.

It will be in order now for the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Robinson, of the American Federation of Labor, to read some telegrams that he has received in relation to the meeting.

MR. ROBINSON (reading):

"Philadelphia, Pa.—Mr. Herman Robinson, 25 Third Avenue. Dear Sir—Regret that conditions have arisen in our trade that make it impossible to reach New York to-night. Dennis Hayes."

"Quincy, Mass., April 16th—Very reluctantly must forego interest and pleasure of participating in to-night's meeting. Unexpected turn in trade dispute in this State demands my attention to-day. Am to adjust by application of Peace methods, so am to that degree in the good work. I stand squarely on Peace Resolutions of Minneapolis Convention bearing my name, and wish Cooper Institute meeting greatest success. James Duncan."

MR. BUCHANAN: The telegram just read by the Secretary from Mr. Duncan refers to the resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor at the Minneapolis Convention; and, firmly believing that that resolution voices the sentiment of labor on the question before us, we will present it for action at this meeting. The resolution will now be read by the Secretary.

MR. ROBINSON (reading):

"Whereas, The Delegates to the Minneapolis, Minnesota, Convention of the American Federation of Labor, November, 1906, in convention assembled, believe that action which makes

for the Peace of Nations is intimately bound up with the welfare of the workers of all nations, and that labor should make an organized effort to aid the movement for arbitration on international disputes; therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the President of the American Federation of Labor is hereby instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each local union affiliated thereto and to each local union of affiliated national or international bodies, also to every affiliated central body and state branch, and notify them that it is the sense of this convention that each local union, central or state body should communicate with their representatives in Congress asking whether they belong to or are in sympathy with the Arbitration Group, and requesting them and the President of the United States to give the support of our government to the resolutions of the Interparliamentary Union, regarding the subjects to be discussed at the second Hague Conference, to the end that there shall be established:

"1. A general arbitration treaty. 2. A periodic world assembly. 3. Impartial investigation of all difficulties before hostilities are engaged in between nations. 4. Immunity of private property at sea in time of war."

This resolution was adopted at the Convention held at Minneapolis last November. I move, Mr. Chairman, that this resolution, adopted by the American Federation of Labor, be adopted by this meeting.

MR. BUCHANAN: You have heard the motion.

(Several voices seconded the motion.)

MR. BUCHANAN: Those in favor of the adoption or re-affirmation of the resolutions as read by the Secretary will say Aye.

(There was a storm of Ayes.)

MR. BUCHANAN: The Ayes have it; so ordered.

As I have already announced, several of the gentlemen who were to speak here could not arrive on account of trade matters that are keeping them, and we have had to change the program, so that you will not find upon the printed program you have in your hands the names of all the speakers, nor the order in which they will speak; but, as I have already said, I am satisfied that

you will go away pleased with what you will hear from the platform to-night, notwithstanding the disappointment that the committee has met with. It will not be your disappointment.

Now I take pleasure in introducing as the first speaker this evening one of the veterans of the labor movement in America—the Hon. Terence V. Powderly. (Applause.)

Labor and Peace

TERENCE V. POWDERLY

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: When Brother Buchanan intimated to me a few moments ago that some of those who were to come to-night and speak to you had not arrived, and asked me to help out, I inquired what he wanted me to talk on, and he said: "Well, on the platform, and about fifteen minutes." (Laughter). So you will not be troubled for any length of time by me.

These are peaceful times. We are in the days of Peace. It is in the air. It is in the home, and it's everywhere. It is the talk of even the fellows who are fighting. They are all hoping for a day of Peace, and so it is a hopeful sign. It is eminently fit and proper that upon this platform, in this institution, labor's voice should be raised in behalf of Peace, for if any body of men in the nation, or any element in the nation longs for Peace, works for it, strives for it and honestly wishes to have it, that element is the labor element of the nation. It may be that because we have been in war, time and again, that the idea has grown that we did not want Peace, but it was simply because conditions forced war upon us that we were obliged to enter upon it and not because we desired it. (Applause.) To have Peace at a sacrifice of honor is not what man wants, particularly organized working men. A working man desires honor first (applause), and if that can be had with Peace he wants it, but if it must be got through war, it will be because he cannot get it through Peace.

Patrick Henry said over a hundred years ago, and when I go back a hundred years don't imagine that I am going to stretch my fifteen minutes a bit. (Laughter.) He said: "Three millions of people armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, are invincible to any force that

may be sent against us." He spoke then in the interest of Peace and of a war not yet begun, which he hoped would not begin, but which he did not shrink from when the issues at stake commanded him to go forward. So to-night in that same land, with 80,000,000 of people declaring for Peace through their representatives, working for Peace through their agents, demanding Peace on every platform, why Peace will have to come; it must come; it's in the air, and no nation is so well calculated or so well fitted to command Peace as ours. (Applause.)

How shall it be brought about? I think that labor and capital, the employer and the employe, have shown the way whereby it may be done or how it may be done. There was a time when your Honored Chairman and I were in the thick of the fight for labor's emancipation. If any man had said to us that the employers of labor and the employed would meet together, sit down together as the lion and the lamb, without the lamb being on the inside, he would have been laughed at! It was not dreamed of as among the possibilities then, but to-day the employer and the employed meet, and they take each other by the hand, instead of by the neck, as they used to do years ago. We clasp hands to-day, and the voice of reason is heard.

Under the admirable leadership of a Gompers (applause) it is possible for labor to command the respect, the close attention and the friendly attitude of those who employ labor. It could not be done years ago, for we were tilling new ground. We were not acquainted with each other then. You know they might think that we were all right, but they did not know it, and what was worse, they did not know that we knew it.

A man was going up to a farm house one day when a dog started after him. The dog walked faster than the man did, then the man started to run; the dog had the best of it again; so when the man got up to the door, he did not wait to knock; he dispensed with the formality of ringing the bell, even; he turned the knob, and to his great relief the door opened and he walked in and shut the door, with the dog on the outside. Then the man of the house came to the door and said: "What is the matter with you? What is your hurry?" "Why," he answered, "the dog out there; that big dog." The man of the house looked out and said: "Why, that is only Bruno, our dog; he won't bite; don't you know?" "Yes," he said, "I know he won't bite; you know he

won't bite, but the dog don't know it." (Laughter.) We didn't know each other in those days. We do now, and we know that there is no more potent voice in favor of Peace than the voice of labor. We know also that there is no more manly voice demanding Peace than the voice of labor. We know, furthermore, that there is no more consistent voice demanding Peace than the voice of labor. And when after a while you hear those who are duly accredited to speak for labor from this platform, you will realize that the few words I have said to you on that subject are true.

I made a lot of notes since Buchanan told me I had to talk, but I won't have to use them, for my fifteen minutes are nearly ended, and fortunately there are others here whom we did not suppose would come. I will take no more of your time. I simply come to you, as the Chairman said, as one of the veterans of the labor movement. There was a time when I knew all about the labor movement—twenty-five years ago; oh, yes, more than that; there was not anything in the labor movement that I did not know. And now that I am fifty-eight years young, I know that all the things that I thought I knew when I was twenty-eight years old did not count for much. You know I have forgotten a lot and so will every man. I have forgotten that there should be enmity between those who are dealing with a great public question. I believe they should understand each other and their cause first and foremost, so that when a difference arises they can canvass the situation from top to bottom. If all men did that always, there would be no more trouble.

I thank you for the attention you have given me (applause) and I will ask you to bear with me one minute. I have asked the Chairman to use this gavel to-night. He used it before; it was used on many occasions where he was an officer. It has been used all over the world; it has been used always in the interest of Peace, always in a good and honorable cause. It will never be used in a bad cause; and I shall esteem it more highly after to-night, having been once again handled by my old co-worker, Joe Buchanan. (Applause.)

MR. BUCHANAN:

The next speaker is at the head of one of the best-known local labor organizations, an organization that is known wherever trade unionism is known, an organization that has found success

in times of trouble through arbitration and yet has never been found wanting when a fight was necessary. I take pleasure in introducing James J. Murphy, President of Typographical Union No. 6, New York City. (Applause.)

Organized Labor, the Advocate of Peace

JAMES J. MURPHY

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The voice of labor is on the side of Peace. Especially is this true of Union Labor; for in the proportion that labor is organized and has progressed along the natural lines of organization, it is intelligent.

As education advances man toward a higher and better civilization, he leaves farther and farther behind him the crudities and cruelties of barbarism and comes to a more perfect understanding of the rights of others.

The intelligent workingman of this country is a conservator of that grand principle written in the Declaration of Independence: the right to Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. He sees in wars between nations a violation of that principle—the destruction of Life, invasion of Liberty and obstruction of the pursuit of Happiness.

And he sees, looking at the case from a personal standpoint, that it is *his* life which is taken, *his* liberty which is invaded, and *his* happiness which is obstructed.

Statesmen, financiers and captains of industry may and do make wars, but the workers fight the battles. (Applause.) Those who were the wives of workingmen before the war are their widows after it. The children who are left fatherless at the battle's end are the sons and daughters of workingmen. (Applause.)

It is also true that the burdens which wars place upon nations that engage in them bear more heavily upon the workers than upon any other class of citizens. It is a pretty well recognized axiom of political economy that the consumer pays the tax. All that the workingman earns he consumes—this I state as a general proposition—he is, therefore, unable to transfer any part of his burden to the account of another through the channels of trade, or by any other method.

The workingman's pound of tea, his plug of tobacco, his coat, his hat, his shoes, and the coats, hats, shoes and everything else that his family uses, may be taxed, and he has to pay or go without.

When any part of this tax is levied upon him for the purpose of discharging the costs of war he receives nothing in return.

The thousands of millions wrung by wars from the brawn and brain of Labor would construct a counterpart of this building out of the purest gold and garland yon columns with precious gems.

There have been wars that were fought to escape the yoke of tyranny, and, when successful, were of immeasurable benefit to the liberated, although the cost in life and treasure was sometimes enormous; but these were revolutions—peoples warring against the injustice or cruelty of their own governments or rulers.

We are here considering wars between nations. Such wars are often due to the jingoism of rulers, the *casus belli* often being nothing more than a personal slight or affront, which is trivial when compared with the terrible cost of retaliation.

There are other wars which are for the purpose of extending markets—to secure advantages in what is called “doing business” with the people of a foreign country. And generally there is included among the objects of wars of the latter class the desire to exploit the natural resources of the contested country and to lay its people under tribute to improved methods of industrial and financial exploitation. (Applause.)

Whether the object of a proposed war is revenge or business, those who, as I have said, do the fighting and pay the costs, are not consulted.

Those who imagine that their dignity or the dignity of some satellite has been slighted, and those who expect to personally benefit by the results of the war, decide the issue and then call upon those whose counsel has not been sought and whose desires have not been considered to do the fighting and bear the burdens.

The intelligent workers of all lands are beginning to understand these truths, and, as they have come to see that their class has been used to satisfy the jingoism of political leaders and

the cupidity of mercenary business interests, they have also learned the truth of the Brotherhood of Man.

While not lacking by one heart-beat the full measure of that love of country which we call "patriotism"; while bowing the head to his country's flag with a reverence not one whit less than was felt by those who came and went before him, the workingman of to-day has reached a plane from which he can see and appreciate the love of country and flag felt by his brother across the border or on the ocean's other side, and he protests against murdering or being murdered by that brother. (Applause.)

Applause or laudation may bring the flush of foolish pride to the unthinking or forgetful "man behind the gun," but the enlightened, progressive man of labor carries a heart full of sympathy and compassion for the man in front of the gun.

When jingoism stalked from end to end of the British Isles, lashing itself into a fury as it bellowed for war in South Africa, but one considerable element raised its voice in opposition and appealed for other and less brutal ways of settling the existing troubles. That voice was the voice of Union Labor, speaking through chosen representatives. Though the plea fell upon deaf ears, and one of the least justifiable and most mercenary of wars was cruelly carried to the bitter end, all Great Britain to-day sadly regrets that the Government turned its back upon the spokesman of Union Labor, who counselled Peace and prophetically foretold the disappointment which would follow such a war as was proposed by the jingoes and their mercenary allies.

In conclusion I repeat that Labor—Organized Labor—is on the side of Peace.

Because of the inherent selfishness of mankind—which has not yet learned wisdom, and because of our industrial system and the conditions contingent thereto, trades unionism is still a militant movement; but it is constantly striving to bring about the substitution of the Court of Reason for the murderous contest of force in the settlement of differences between opposing interests.

That arrogant defiance of Peace, that virulent microbe of strife, "Nothing to arbitrate," had not its birth in the Trade Union, and rarely does it find a friend there. We advocate

arbitration as a substitute for open conflict between ourselves and our employers and, adapting a thought recently expressed by Andrew Carnegie, we believe that what is good for use at home is good for use abroad.

Therefore, I confidently say that the Trades Unions of the United States—and, I believe, the Trades Unions of all countries—are pledged to the accomplishment of the principles enunciated by the Hague Conference and will do everything within their power to assist in that good work.

No one more than the Trade Unionist hopes for the early fulfilment of this prophecy of that great son of France, Victor Hugo, who said: "In the twentieth century wars will cease, and men the world over will be brothers." (Great applause.)

MR. BUCHANAN:

I am sure the audience will agree when I say that the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, which is absent in the person of three or four of its members who were expected to be here, has been fully and ably represented upon the platform to-night. (Applause.)

Now, my friends, while you do the fighting in times of war, the other sex bears probably the heavier burden and carries in its breast the aching heart; therefore, no meetings in the interests of Peace would be complete if the voice of woman were not heard. It therefore affords me great pleasure now to introduce as the next speaker a woman who has been one of the workers in the cause of labor for a quarter of a century, and who represents upon this platform to-night the Women's Trade Union League of New York, Miss O'Reilly. (Applause.)

The Cry of Humanity

MISS LEONORA O'REILLY

FRIENDS, FELLOW WORKINGMEN AND FELLOW WORKING-WOMEN: I feel very much like saying, after having listened to the speeches which have already been made, Peace! we are going to have Peace, even if we fight for it. (Applause and laughter.)

One of our American writers has said that at every moment some one country more than any other represents the sentiment of the future of mankind. What a glorious thing if from this

Republic of ours, we could send forth such a message for the future of mankind. Peace we must have, no matter how we come by it.

Thus far, so far as I know, the world has seen only two forms of civilization: the military and the industrial; and the industrial form of civilization is only just beginning to appear.

In looking up a definition of war to bring before this audience, I found in one of our encyclopædias this definition: "The History of War is the history of the Human Race." Now friends, I want you to think of that—the history of war is the history of the human race—then, don't you think we had better begin and rewrite the history of the human race? (Applause.) And who could better write that history than working men and working women? (Applause.) We certainly have helped to carry on the industrial fight. Who, then, could better write the true story?

One fact not generally known about the labor movement is that, when we get inside the great industrial army, we really forget whether the soldier is man or woman. We simply want to be part of the great world's work. And I want, so much, to have you understand what that definition meant to me, a worker and I hope to have it mean as much to you, working men and working women. Think of it! Must it be so? Is it true that the history of the human race is war? War means destruction. Ah, no! Isn't it that we have only had the microbe of conquest in our heads and hearts? We have not really learned what brotherhood and sisterhood means. We have not really learned the lesson of the labor movement, that we are brother and sister all the world over. (Applause.)

Glad indeed am I to be so honored as to be asked to come and speak my word for organized women at this Peace Meeting. The gentleman has said truly that while the men are fighting in the field, the women must carry on all the other work. Women have work enough in times of Peace, but try to think, try to imagine what a woman's part is when the men go to be shot down in battle. (Applause.) Not only do they carry on all the industries that men carry on in times of Peace, but then they must also do the work as mothers and wives. Just think of that. Surely, no matter how weak the voice of woman, it must be

heard in this Peace Congress; and especially the voice of the woman or organized labor must be heard, for, if the future of our land is to be a peaceful and an industrial one, it must be brought about by the intelligence of the organized workers.

A VOICE: Good boy! (Great applause and laughter, in which latter the speaker joined.)

MISS O'REILLY:

I take off my hat to the brother in the back of the room because he has acknowledged that there is no such thing as sex in the labor movement. (Great applause and cries of "good!")

You ask what is the attitude of the labor movement towards war? Have we got to ask ourselves that question? Don't we all know it in our hearts? Don't we all carry it in the very marrow of our being? Wasn't it the workingmen's international movement fifty years ago that said, "You will never establish Peace until you abolish all your standing armies"? Now, I am not advocating the abolition of one standing army as against another, but I do not believe that you can have Peace while you are preparing for war. Peace will not be attained to-day, but we must look to that future which we intend to reach. Therefore, I maintain, the works of the world belong to the great constructive force of the world and cannot for their life's sake have anything to do with war or the destructive side. (Applause.) If we mean Peace, we must go about it honestly and honorably. (Applause.) So I believe with those workingmen of fifty years ago, if we really mean Peace, then we must advocate those measures which will do away with war. You cannot train men to be soldiers and then ask them to be anything else. You cannot ask them not to make use (applause) of the training which you have spent your substance to give them.

Now I am reminded of the story of the Irishman, who was supposed to believe in predestination. A neighbor saw him going out with a gun on his shoulder and said: "Why, Pat, I thought you believed in predestination?" "So I do, but perhaps the other fellow's time has come." (Laughter.) Now while we have our armies and navies trained, you will notice it is always the thought that the other fellow's time may have come. You can't preach brotherhood in that way. (Applause.) However, whatever we may think on that score, we do want Peace. The

majority of our people want Peace, and I think we want to send a message to The Hague which will make them understand, not only that the people here, but people all over the world want Peace. (Applause.) In reading over the messages and the thoughts of all the splendid minds to-day which are concentrating themselves on the thought of Peace, and what best we can do to attain the blessings of peace, it came upon me like a horror that over nineteen hundred years ago we had the Nazarene, the Man who has always been called "The Prince of Peace," and yet in our midst to-day one of the followers of that Gospel, one of the followers of that Prince of Peace, asserts that there can be no such thing as Peace, and thanks God for a standing army which keeps watch over the turbulent and seditious of our city. I only mention this to ask what it is that makes so many of us get so twisted in our mentality, if not in our morality, for surely if ever a being lived who wanted Peace, it was the Nazarene, the gentle Carpenter. (Applause.) And we find to-day one of His followers at the International Peace Conference thanking God for the standing armies.

A VOICE: Never was His follower.

MISS O'REILLY:

Never was His follower? Perhaps not. I think a great many people who think they are His followers, let themselves out once in a while and then we know them for what they are. (Applause.)

But surely the solidarity of the human race will never be accomplished until the workers of the world unite for its accomplishment. (Applause. A voice, "Bravo!")

I should have said that the feeling which came into my heart when I read that minister's utterances is the old, old thought which makes me say once again: Workers of the World, you must teach this Peace doctrine yourselves, if you want it taught. You organized workers know that the A B C of the labor movement teaches that the solidarity of the human race will never be accomplished until the workers of the world unite for its accomplishment, namely, by agitation, organization and education. Those are our three methods of Peace. (Great applause.) And if we but do that work, we have very little time for the work of destruction. You know we are many, and we need a great deal of education to get us to see things straight

and clear and not be fighting amongst ourselves in our own little places. (Applause.) We have got to learn that labor's cause is the same all over the world. (Applause.) When we get that into our hearts and souls, we won't fight very much longer. We won't have very many battles. When we understand that labor's cause is a universal cause, it will not be possible to get the Frenchmen to come out and fight the Germans, and the Germans to come out and fight the Irishmen. We know that our business is to establish the dignity of labor; on that we must first agree, and then try to make us fight on any other issues if you can! (Applause.)

I don't know whether you know that story that Carlyle tells of Dumbdrudges, or as he calls it, the Town of Dumbdrudge. He says that in a certain town there were certain people brought up at the expense of the community; they were brought up, fed, taught trades; then they were dressed up in red coats or something of that kind, and guns put in their hands; and then in another corner of the world there was another group of people who were brought up and taught trades, crafts, and educated and sustained at the cost of the community, and those two sets of people, for some reason or another, were brought together face to face and somebody said "Fire!" Then there were sixty fewer human beings in the world. They fired simply because they were told, and shot each other down. Then in his grumbling Scottish way he said: "Did these men have anything against each other?" "No." "Then why did they do this thing?" "Simpleton! their governors had fallen out; and instead of shooting one another, had the cunning to make these poor blockheads shoot."

How much better is the story that Lafcadio Hearn tells about the singer. It is the story about a singing woman with a beautiful voice that Lafcadio Hearn heard, a voice that comes out of an ugly mouth and from a face that is pockmarked. Out of that ugly face and from the mouth of that human being comes a song that is so glorious, so beautiful, that he, a foreigner, understands there is something in it which touches all of humanity. It is as if the cry of all the people of all the ages were stirred in him and he wanted to do something on his part towards the uplifting of humanity. It seems to me that that is the lesson that organization teaches to every member of organized labor. We

may be ugly and do strange things, not the right kind of things sometimes, things that cannot be explained to the rest of the world, but that cry, that song that we are teaching is the unity of the human race. We are doing it in the best way that we can. We are trying to sing our song of construction, brotherhood and humanity, and we must not let it be interrupted by these thoughts of war, or be led to war with each other for petty reasons. Our cause must be a common cause for the uplifting of humanity, and that *re-writing* of history.

Now if I should finish with that thought, I fear you might think I was only a sentimental woman after all, one that does not know about things practical. So I am going to be just a little bit practical in the end, because you know we are not supposed to have sentiment these days; the practical people are the only people who count or do anything, so we are told. But now I want you to think what is the cost of our wars, what is the cost of the standing armies, and what we lose by lack of production, and the cost to us by the increased taxation, the frightful waste of human life, and the great loss of time from profitable occupations in this useless and wasteful occupation of slaughtering each other. Think of the waste that goes on in that! I may not be perfectly correct in my quoting of figures, but wasn't it a million dollars a day that the Japanese war cost? The Russian side surely cost as much as the Japanese. That makes two million dollars a day as the cost of that war in figures. Multiply that by 365 days, a year, and that war lasted more than a year, and we have \$730,000,000 spent for destruction.

We are beginning to think in this country that there can be some kind of industrial education for children, that there should be some kind of industrial preparation for life. If we are going to do away with war, we must put Peace on the best foundation, and that is the training up of the children for the work they are going to perform.

Now, at a rough estimate, it costs \$150 a year after the public school education to get one of these children through a training school which prepares him or her to do the work that his hands are trained to do. According to that estimate, then, we could have educated industrially 4,800,000 children for the cost of that one year of war. Now those are figures that we ought to think of, and as a woman I want to insist that when we disband

our armies and navies, we should use those splendid warships for taking the children around the world. (Great applause.) Horribly impracticable, I know, to ask a thing like that, but yet I believe I am going to live to see the day when it will be done. (Applause.)

One thing I hope we will advocate at these Peace Conferences. It is always a good plan to see far into the future and to ask for all you ever hope to realize; ask for the whole thing, then you may get a little speck. (Applause.) But ask for all you want; it may take you years to lead up to it, but right in the beginning, know your ideal. Therefore I advocate the abolition of all wars. (Applause.) But I do hope that somebody will advocate that practical measure which I have read the French teachers advocate. I read that the French teachers in their Council have advocated the taking down of all ornaments from the school rooms which have anything to do with militarism. Now you see they realize that if in the young heart of the child you develop the worship of the soldier as a hero, you cannot get the idea of militarism out of his head when he grows up. You must inspire the child when he is young, and in order to do this you must surround him with the right kind of environment. Don't have on the walls pictures of heroes in the shape of soldiers, or pictures of bloody battles as inspiring things for the young mind to look upon. (Applause.)

I believe firmly that what you know as civilization—I was going to tell you I don't think very much of the civilization we have thus far (applause)—but what we know as civilization today can only improve and advance with the passing of militarism, and you, the workers, you in your numbers, must send your voice across the ocean so that there will be no mistaking your stand on this Peace and war question. Let your voice ring loud and clear, that organized labor stands once and for all for organization, co-operation and the solidarity of humanity. (Great applause.)

MR. BUCHANAN.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It is my pleasure to introduce to you one of the labor men who has won a place of prominence, not on the field of battle, but in the line of civic duty. I am going to introduce to you now the Secretary of State for the State of New York. He is eligible to speak upon this platform because he is a

member of the Tobacco Workers' Union and President of the Rochester Trade and Labor Council—John S. Whalen, Secretary of State of New York. (Applause).

MR. JOHN S. WHALEN:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, AS WELL AS FELLOW UNIONISTS: I came to New York more particularly to learn and to hear many of the things that are being spoken of in convention here. I have attended many of the conferences. I hope that I am not amiss when I say it is a pleasure and honor to attend a labor gathering such as this. And I might say in the few short moments allotted me, and will say, that three of the best arguments I have heard during my entire stay in the city were advanced here this evening. (Applause.)

There is little if anything new in this proposition to me. I have been a member of the Trades Union movement for fifteen long years, and I realize that in that movement we have been working honestly and earnestly towards Peace. My belief, and one saying that I have always used in the Trades Union movement is, "Practice what you preach; do by the other fellow as you wish to be done by." It is a simple, easy teaching, and we take the same stand to-day as we have always taken; and I repeat that the remarks from the gentlemen and lady who have preceded me have been the most practical talks I have heard during this entire conference in the city of New York.

There are other speakers here to-night. I did not expect to have this pleasure, and I am merely going to occupy the few moments allotted to me and give way to the speaker who will take up the subject more in detail. I thank you.

MR. BUCHANAN:

The next speaker of the evening is a gentleman not directly connected with the labor movement, but one whose sympathies are with it and whose efforts are expended in assisting it—the Rev. Dr. Algernon S. Crapsey, of Rochester. (Applause.)

The Squirearchy of Peace

DR. ALGERNON S. CRAPSEY

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN AND LADIES: I am at this moment engaged in solving a problem which is of some

interest to me. I am endeavoring to discover who I am. (Laughter.) I have two programs in my hand, and in one of them I am designated as an Esquire and in the other I have two initials after my name. Now I prefer to take the former title to-night, because I find that it is a title which has been given to all the previous speakers. All of us have been ennobled. We belong now to the titled nobility of the earth. (Laughter.) Mr. Samuel Gompers is an Esquire, and Mr. Murphy likewise, and so to-night I prefer to speak in the name of the Squirearchy rather than of the Doctors of Divinity. (Laughter.) Because, I will have you understand, the squire is a very considerable man in the world. He had his origin at the time when knighthood was in flower. He was usually some slip of the nobility, who was sent to learn the trade of fighting, and his business was to look after his knight, to burnish his armor, to sharpen his spear, to hang properly his mace, and to saddle and bridle his horse and hold the horse until the knight mounted; and then in due time he expected himself to become a knight and go out fighting on his own account. And so these squires had their place in the world until the time that knighthood came to an end.

In the meanwhile the Squirearchy had been learning some truths; the squire had been ascertaining the fact that this fighting business was not all it had been cracked up to be. (Laughter.) Sometimes he got a broken head; and then, owing to certain developments that went on, he found that his sword was of little or no account; so when the knighthood period passed away, we find that the squire settled down on the land and bought a farm and married a wife and got for himself children and began to spend his days in other occupations. Then he came to learn that there are other things in the world worth doing as well as fighting. He began to discover that communion with his wife and children; that the song of the birds and the coloring of the flowers, were worth while. And when he was no longer occupied in putting his brother man to death, he had time to enter into these, and he became, in a measure, a civilized man, and an artist.

And now, we, the Squirearchy, in whose name I speak to-night, come with certain thoughts concerning war. We have in a measure outgrown the knighthood period, and we have in a measure outgrown the whole war period. We do not come

to-night to cast reflections upon our ancestors, and we do come to-night as warriors. We are such by birthright, and our only contention is that war shall be carried on according to methods which are now required by the progress of the age.

The old means of carrying on a war are obsolete. We have reached a point in our development where it is no longer good taste on the part of two men who differ to black one another's eyes, or to give one another a bloody nose, or to knock the breath out of one another. That is not good form any more between man and man. There may be in this company some who differ with me; there may be some here, some Bowery boys (laughter) that still think that the noble art of self-defence is absolutely necessary for maintaining the dignity and the stability of human nature, and that to give a good rounder with the right hand and another with the left is the way to establish a reputation as a man. (Laughter.) But we, the Squirearchy, have outgrown that, and we, as I say, no longer consider that polite or good form; and therefore our first objection to the present method of carrying on war is that it is not in good taste; and it doesn't make any difference whether you brain a man with your fist or do it with a fist of mail, or whether you stand behind your fist or stand behind a gun; it is a foul thing to take that wonderful organ, the human brain, and scatter it upon the earth and trample it down and destroy all its capacity for beauty of thought. That is our first objection. We say it is bad taste. It is not esthetic, and if any man wants to understand what war is, let him go out the day after the battle. It is just as repulsive to see the human flesh in the raw, when that human flesh is put in the raw by the instruments of modern warfare, as it is to see it in the prize ring, and therefore when two nations come together for the purpose of simply engaging in this amusement, we prefer to withdraw. (Applause and laughter and cries of "good!")

Our second objection is that this method of settling disputes is very wasteful. In the good old times, when men fought hand to hand, war was not so expensive as it is now, but it was then expensive enough, and our good squire who went out after his knight to the battle and who spent some years in his own campaign, came back a poorer man than he went. And

when the great wars of the Middle Ages closed, then a large proportion of those squires were turned adrift and found themselves poverty-stricken in the world, and they had to lie naked upon the ground, and they came to the conclusion that it was wiser for them to spend their money in sustaining themselves than to spend it in destroying others. We have already had brought out before us, by the previous speaker, the immense wastefulness of our modern warfare. We take of our substance and we cast it into cannon balls, and I am told it costs about three thousand dollars to fire a cannon once. Why that is more than I get in a year! (Laughter.) And so this is our second objection—the wastefulness. Why, surely, we can settle our disputes more economically than this.

And then our third objection is that it is very stupid. I was down a short time ago in Virginia and I came across a bow-legged negro, an old plantation negro, and we got into conversation about the late unpleasantness between the states, and this man said to me: "Dar was good men on bofe sides, but they didn't have 'telligence 'nuff to think it out, and so they had to fight it out" (laughter), and that is the situation always. It is lack of intelligence, it is sheer stupidity that leads men to substitute force for reason. When men are intelligent, they can sit down and reason out their differences, and they can come to some mode of living together, but it's the stupid men that have to resort to a fight in order to decide these questions between men and men. (Applause.) And, my dear friends, of all the stupid men that are born into this world, nine-tenths of them get into places of government.

You know how it was in the days of the terror in France when poor Robespierre was in command. Robespierre came to the conclusion at last that the terror was a blunder, but the poor fellow did not have wit enough to see any other way and so he said: "Let the terror go on." And so there be those to-day in command of our governments all over the earth who seem to think that there is no possible way of getting along without having a great big army or a great big navy. And of all the stupidities that have ever been enacted in the world, two of the most stupid are the dealings with the South Africans and with the Filipinos. (Applause.)

Now, those of us who have attained unto the Squirearchy,

those of us who are now titled nobles and men of high estate, have attained an intelligence that leads us to see that there is some other way out, and our first thought is that before we go to war we should have a reasonable cause for it. About nine-tenths of the causes are absolutely puerile.

Now, a great many wars have been entered into simply to prove who is the best man, and very frequently the results are the same as in the case of an Irishman, invited by his brother, who had risen somewhat in life, to attend this brother's wedding. When he came in the brother said to him: "Mike, go up to the room at the top and leave your coat"; and in a few minutes the brother came out and found Mike down at the foot of the stairway, with his coat torn and his face all covered with gore; and he said to him: "Why, Mike, what in the devil is the matter with you?" and he said: "I went up into the room and I saw a guy there. I said to him, says I, 'Who bees ye?' and he said he was the best man,—and he was." (Great laughter.) And so it is when some of our great nations take hold of a little Boer, they find after all he is the best man. (Applause.) It is a poor reason for going to war simply to assert our dignity and to let the world know that we are not afraid. That no longer commends itself to the Squirearchy. We have got over that. We already know that one man is stronger than another. We don't need to test it. (Laughter.)

And then the next reason for going to war is that you desire to take possession of your neighbor's territory. The good old days of the highwaymen have passed, for the Squirearchy. We no longer look upon the highwayman as an altogether reputable member of society; and why we should look upon a highwayman-nation any more favorably than we do upon the individual highwayman I cannot tell; and when any nation arms itself or thinks of arming itself for the purpose of appropriating the goods of its neighbors, then there should be some kind of a tribunal that would bring that nation to terms and hang it (great applause)—or they should hang the men who lead the nation. (Applause.) And if the crimes of the rulers were punished, there would be a considerable amount of execution going on, I fear. But a great Providence takes care of that, and every nation that sins against the law of justice, answers to the God of Justice. So this cause for going to war

is one that the Squirearchy can no longer approve of, but we are asked in this day to go to war for the purpose of "benevolent assimilation." (Laughter.) We want to civilize these people (laughter) and the only way we can find of civilizing them, is by shooting them through the heart. (Applause and laughter.) Now this does not commend itself to us as the wisest way of assimilation. If we want to conquer those men, we will conquer them by other means than these; and so dismiss all these causes for war. Then we will ask ourselves, why should we go to war? Why, indeed, if not because the knights want us to. In the good old days the knight did his own fighting, and he bore in a great measure his own expense. That was very honorable and very just, but now the knight sits at home. (Laughter and applause.) And when he has a war quarrel on hand, he says to us squires, to us common people (laughter): "We have got a fight on hand; now come and enlist, and I will give you thirteen per and a bellyful of bullets." (Great laughter and applause.) And we say, "No, thank you." (Laughter.) "We can earn more money staying at home, and we prefer to retain our inward apparatus for better uses." (Laughter.) And so we decline the invitation.

There is another reason why we decline it. It is a reason that I do not like to speak of in polite society—but it is against the principles of our religion. (Great laughter.) When I hear a clergyman or a newspaper editor egging on a fight, I always have in mind a man at a dog-fight. He says: "Sick him, Towse; sick him Tige," and when Towse and Tige get together at each other's throat, why the man is perfectly safe, because he cannot be a dog. (Great laughter.) And so our clergymen and our editors are out of the fight, and they can egg it on as much as they please. (Laughter.) But I say, it is against the principles of our religion. Our religion teaches us that this other fellow is our brother, as we have heard to-night; and we cannot quite bring ourselves up to the point of knocking our brother on the head; it rather goes against us.

And then we are told that we all have one Father, and we cannot quite make it seem just right to go to our Father and ask him to help us whip our brother. (Laughter.) A Moham-medan in London said to the English: "Why, you Christians are strange folk. Here you Englishmen are praying to your

Christian God to help you defeat the Boers, and the Boers are praying to the same Christian God to help them defeat the English. Now, let me ask you a question: 'If you were God, what would you do?'" (Great laughter.)

Therefore, as it is against the principles of our religion, we must, as far as possible, withdraw from all this. Yet, as I said, we are still in favor of warfare. Why, warfare is going to continue always; warfare is going to continue in heaven. Warfare is the rule, but there is always a better way. We have weapons of warfare that are not carnal; weapons that are mighty to the casting down of strongholds.

If you want to conquer people, what are you going to do? Are you going out and kill just as many as possible, and make the rest of them your bitter haters? No, that is not the way to do. If you want to conquer them, just go without any army at all, just as I walk down here among men who have bad reputations in New York (laughter) and simply trust. Show that you have no fear. Give yourself to the people that you want to conquer; show them that you have nothing in your heart but love for them; that you mean to be just in all your dealings with them; and that if any question arises between you and them, then you will yield that question at once for the sake of maintaining your relation of good-will and affection towards them.

I have heard it said here to-night, I have heard it said upon every platform in this Peace Congress, that it is quite impossible for any nation to disarm to-day—that it would be immediately over-run by all the rest of the nations of the world, that it would be wiped out of existence. Don't you believe it! (Cries of "no, no," and great applause.) No, sir. No, sir. That is an experiment that has been tried twice in the history of the world, and that experiment was the most successful of all the world has ever seen. (Cries of "good," and applause.) It was tried for 400 years by a great body in the heart of the Roman Empire. You have Christianity here to-day because Christianity for 400 years did that very thing, stood in the midst of its foes, unarmed. Whenever any man was called to die, he said: "Yes, I will die gladly for my faith," but never once through that 400 years did those men, although they were one-third of the population, raise their hand in self-defence. And what was the result? (Great

applause.) They brought the Roman Empire to their feet, and they exalted their standard above the eagles of the Empire. (Great applause.) Now don't you believe that any nation to-day, if it disarm in the name of justice, and especially if it were a strong nation, would be over-run by the world. It would attract to itself the whole moral force of the world at that instant; it would be the moral leader which would lay the way open for that higher civilization for which we are all pleading to-night.

And there was another experiment. During the whole of what we call the Middle Ages, Europe was just one seething mass of warfare. Every house was a castle; every highway was a danger, but there were men in those generations whose hearts were for Peace, and they simply went and withdrew themselves and built themselves little shelters in the woods. They never raised hand against any man; they left the postern gates of their monasteries open to anyone who would come in, armed or unarmed, and what was the consequence? The wiping out of the monasteries? Not a bit; the monasteries rose up and ruled the whole world. And yet we are told again and again by the wisest that we cannot disarm.

Suppose you were to see me here with a belt around me. (Great laughter.) What kind of a man would you take me to be? I am not afraid to go down into any street in the city to-night or any other night, just as I am. There is a chance that somebody may kill me, but it is a bare chance, and it is so remote that I will take the chance every time. Now, we individuals have already disarmed and none of us have suffered any evil consequence, and no evil consequence would come at all if the nations were to disarm. Not the slightest. We simply would all cease to be swashbucklers, and we would become civilized gentle folk, and we would take all the governors and the rulers, and the kings and the presidents, and we would make them squires, as Mr. Gompers is. (Great applause and laughter.)

Now my dear friends, that is my message to you to-night, and of course no one will heed it, but the day is at hand when it must be heeded, because all the Christian nations are on the point of bankruptcy. When I was in the Duchy of Baden some years ago, I saw there a sight which impressed me very deeply. One morning I heard the sound of military music. I looked out of the window and saw regiment after regiment passing by. I

asked what was the occasion of their passing, and I was told that the forces of the Duchy were going down to Wurtemberg to engage in war manœuvres there. Then I was out on the bank of Lake Constance, and I saw there a woman and a cow harnessed to a plow. Thousands of men were carried away down yonder to learn the art of war, and the women were compelled to labor, that these might have their martial trappings. And that is what war is. And you and I, gentlemen and ladies, have laid upon us the task of preaching the Gospel of Peace. (Great applause.)

MR. BUCHANAN:

The next speaker needs no special introduction to an audience acquainted at all with the American labor movement. It is a pleasure to-night particularly to present him because of the fact that so many—two or three at least of his associates—whom we expected to be here, were detained elsewhere. Mr. Samuel Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor. (Applause.)

Humanity's Growth Towards Peace

SAMUEL GOMPERS

MR. CHAIRMAN, FELLOW UNIONISTS AND FRIENDS: I am greatly gratified that circumstances should so have shaped themselves as to permit me to attend this meeting this evening, much as I really believed it would have been almost impossible to be here.

I want to be here to-night because I want to mingle my voice with the voices of men and women of labor of New York in protest against the horrors of war and in favor of the demand for Universal Peace.

We men and women of labor have had large experience in the great movement of the toiling masses to secure some degree of recognition of the rights which have been too long denied us. The wrongs which we have had to bear for so long a period, the voices of the masses of labor for centuries, cry out in protest against the burdens that have been borne, and yearnings, unexpressed and often inarticulate, arise for the day when justice shall reign among men. (Applause.)

We have had to fight as well as to argue for our rights, not that we loved the pursuit of conquest, not that we loved or had any heart in contest, but simply that we were permeated with the conviction that justice to labor would not and could not be secured until those who stood in the path of progress and success had manifested their design; that nothing would be gained for labor until the myriads of laborers of our country should determine and demonstrate to their opponents that though they loved Peace, they were not averse to bearing the burdens of war in order to establish justice and right. (Applause.)

It is perhaps only those who have borne the brunt of battle and can bear testimony of contest by their scars that realize its tremendous importance and responsibilities. It was not a mere expression which one of the greatest generals the civil war in our country produced used when he declared at the end of that great contest, "War is hell."

No man and no woman who is engaged in industrial conflict will designate it by a more euphonious term, but when in the course of human events, rights are denied to the toiling masses of our country, as the inalienable rights were denied to our forefathers in the Colonies of America, then the time comes when men and women must assert themselves in order to maintain their integrity, their manhood and their womanhood. (Applause.)

He who has gone through the great struggles, national, international, industrial; he who has borne some of the brunt of battle, will endeavor to find the means to maintain integrity and honor and promote interests without unnecessary contest. I am firmly persuaded that at least within a period of a quarter of a century, there has not occurred a war justified by necessity or by circumstances of human liberty and human rights. (Applause.) The old time land lust of Kings and Emperors must give way to the conscience and the justice and the right of homestead and manhood and independence and intelligence and humanity. (Applause.) Nor will we, as workers, longer consent to be utilized as the fighting forces, to be murdered and mowed down in order to conquer the markets of barbarians or savages. (Applause.)

I heard with a great deal of pleasure to-night the reading of the preamble and resolutions adopted at the Convention of

the American Federation of Labor held at Minneapolis last November, but I should be thoroughly ashamed of myself, as a member of organized labor, if I believed that it was left to the closing days of the year 1906 for organized labor to demonstrate its position upon this great question. I know of no instance within the past half century where the working people of our country, aye the working people of all civilized countries, have met that they did not declare unequivocally their position for International Peace and Brotherhood. (Applause.) Aye, the American Federation of Labor in 1886, in its convention at Baltimore, met the Union stonecutter, the Member of Parliament, William Randal Cremer, who was the first pioneer for International Arbitration. That convention resolved, by unanimous vote, to place the labor movement of America in favor of the abolition of war and for the establishment of Universal Peace. (Applause.) I say this, my friends, because of the fact that to-day we see a reversal of the situation which obtained so largely among the people of our country a few short years ago. All that was necessary then was for some politician, declaring himself a statesman and proclaiming that he was the embodiment of all that was patriotic, to carry some fanciful chip upon his political shoulder and challenge the world to take it off, and men, at the behest of political charlatans and industrial greedy gourmands, would fly at each other's throats in the name of patriotism and nationality; and the wave of enthusiasm that seemed to arise swept into the background any thought of a humanitarian character.

A great change has come over the minds of the working people of the world, and none the less of the American working men; due not to preachments, due not to those who, from the upper strata, wished the workingmen well, but due to the organization and the increased intelligence resulting from the reduction in the hours of labor secured by the organizations of labor. (Great applause.)

The opportunity for leisure and rest and the opportunity for the cultivation of the best that is in us, has made way for a new wave, not the wave of bigotry, of hatred, but the wave of universal love and affection and brotherhood, and the recognition of the principle that after all the man, because he happens to be born in Germany or France or England or Ireland or Scotland

or Italy or Hungary or Poland or Russia, is no less a man than the American citizen with all the claims of patriotism and humanity bestowed upon him. (Great applause.)

To-day we find a peculiar and encouraging condition of affairs. The wave of bigotry and hatred has receded and made way for the most beautiful, the most gratifying wave of enthusiasm for Peace. It is a strange spectacle but nevertheless gratifying. Usually those who love Peace, those who sought success and happiness by peaceful methods, were decried. It is strange indeed, it is wonderful, it is an awakening, a new era, when there can be, as we find to-day, world-wide enthusiasm for Peace. (Applause.) For centuries men have decried the white flag. The white flag was always coupled with the idea of weakness, of cowardice. To-day, thank God, the development has come in the human conscience and mind and the white flag is no longer regarded as an accompaniment or an expression of the yellow streak. It requires some courage for men to assert Peace rather than war. (Applause.)

We have noted upon the battlefield men who, no doubt, have been heroic in their self-sacrifice, and under the stress of enthusiasm and excitement have manifested the largest element of human bravery. But, my friends, that element of warfare is about at an end, by reason of the wonderful effectiveness of modern armaments. Now, frequently men who are contending, army against army, do not see each other and do not know the whereabouts of the enemy. Modern warfare is robbed of the glory—yes, if that might be termed glory—modern warfare is robbed of the glory of hand-to-hand contest, it is now a cold calculation of mathematics written down in cold blood, and when followed, causes each man to be his fellow's murderer, and nothing less. (Applause.)

To-day we urge that it requires more heroism in men and women to bear the brunt of great sacrifice, of quiet, silent suffering for the betterment of the human family, than is manifested upon the gory field of battle. (Applause.) To endeavor to help, to uplift, to benefit our fellows, to make the burdens of life less onerous and to help bear our brother's burdens, to make life brighter and better, to permit the ray of sunshine to enter into the home and to dispel the gloom of the fireside, to make man brighter and nobler and woman more efficient and beautiful

in this great uplifting work, and childhood more expectant of a brighter and better day, is the work of this century which you, the toilers, and the intelligent and sympathetic men and women, are effecting with a heroism and splendid effort that may not be understood or appreciated in our time. But as we sing the glories of the men who have won for us the great attributes and opportunities of freedom in our time, so those who follow us will realize that in our day, in the same measure that we perform our duties to our fellows, we will have performed the same great work for the social uplift and Universal Peace.

May I say just this one word? Like my friend who has preceded me, I did not expect to address this meeting; in fact, when I was asked to be present, I did not believe that it would be possible for me to be here, but our honored Chairman and the presiding genius of the People's Institute, Mr. Smith (applause), asked me a few minutes ago when I entered the hall whether I would not say a word to this meeting upon this all-pervading subject—and I said that I would. Let me just add one word that presses upon my mind for expression. It is this: You cannot hope to secure International Peace by the disarmament of any one of the peoples of the world. I doubt if there is a single thinking American who would advocate, in present conditions, that the American people and the American Government should decide upon the policy of disarmament. Can't do it, my friends. To disarm to-day when the world is an armed camp outside, would mean for that country to be wiped off the face of the map. (Applause.) We can't do that, and I shall not even discuss general disarmament. It is not a question for discussion just now, but let me say this: We hope, by the great pressure of the public conscience of the American people, so to impress it upon the Government of the United States that it in turn will give most explicit instructions to the representatives of the next Hague Conference that, if they cannot agree upon general or gradual disarmament, at least that this constant burden of expansion and growth of armaments shall be arrested for all time to come. (Applause.) When men are engaged in running in a given direction, it is the most difficult task to expect them at one fell swoop to turn around and run back. If we can stop them running, the chances are that the new conscience aroused will

turn their attention in the other direction, and then they may retrace their steps. (Applause.)

The resolutions that have been presented and adopted at this meeting to-night, endorsing and ratifying the position taken by the American Federation of Labor, are a most gratifying sign. If you contemplate the causes for and the causes which lead to war, if you contemplate the results of grab and graft that are expected to result from war, the chances are that you will help to abolish war. (Applause.) The working men have to a considerable extent established, by their trade agreements in their organized labor movement, the principle of Peace, for these are nothing more than industrial treaties, industrial treaties of Peace. I grant you that in our comparatively unorganized condition we are not always capable of defending our position, but we have enunciated it as a principle, and no principle founded on truth or justice or right has ever been promulgated and contested for but what it has been finally crowned with victory. (Applause.) What we aim to accomplish by our meeting to-night here and the meetings elsewhere is to reach the judgment and the conscience of our people. We have no ulterior purpose to serve. We have no profit to gain; we have no human sacrifice that we ask upon the altar of our cause. There is nothing in all the demands which we make upon modern society that is not founded upon the best and the highest conception of human aspirations for love, for right, for justice, for humanity; and in that great cause, all of us may enlist in the hope that final and ultimate justice and righteousness and Peace shall prevail the world over, and recognize and establish for all time to come the universal brotherhood of man. (Great applause.)

MR. BUCHANAN:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The next and last speaker of this evening will be one who brings the message of Peace from a foreign land. Our speakers so far this evening have all been from our own country. The next speaker is a gentleman who has been identified with the International Peace Movement since its inception. I refer to Mr. William T. Stead, the editor of the *London Review of Reviews*. (Great applause.)

I have been requested to announce that Mr. Stead will speak

from this platform on Friday evening under the auspices of the People's Institute, I believe.

MR. SMITH: Yes.

MR. BUCHANAN: On what topic?

MR. SMITH: Mr. Stead will tell.

MR. STEAD: Mr. Chairman——

A VOICE: You're all right, William!

MR. STEAD:

I am all right. There is nothing the matter with me. (Great applause.) But you are not all right. (Renewed applause and laughter.) I must speak plain to you. I don't think you are a satisfactory audience at all. (Great applause and laughter.) I am ashamed of you. (Renewed laughter.) And I tell you why I am ashamed of you, because you seem to be perfectly ready to agree to absolutely contradictory doctrines from the speakers on this platform. When I came in, I heard Mr. Gompers declaring that disarmament was absolutely impossible, and criminal, unless we all disarmed together, and you cheered that. Then I heard Mr. Crapsey saying, That is not right, and you cheered that. (Renewed applause and laughter.) Now I do not think that is sensible. (Applause.) And you cheered that. (Renewed applause and laughter.)

Now I think there cannot be a greater mistake than to be too peaceful. It is because the peaceful people are so horribly peaceful that the warlike people get it all their own way. You remember that Archbishop Paley one time was told by a clergyman as follows: "My wife and I have been married for twenty-five years and we have never had a row." And Archbishop Paley said to him: "My dear sir, what an awfully dull life you must have had!" (Great laughter.)

I tell you another reason why I don't like you. (Great laughter.) At all the peace meetings I have been at since I came to New York there was no kick back from any of you. Now what I feel is that when you get close to a man, he ought in some way or another to indicate that he does not agree with you. Now, you don't ever say anything in America no matter what the speaker says. He may talk the greatest tommyrot in the

world (laughter), and you are all so polite you let him go on talking. (Laughter.) Now what you want to do in this world, when a fellow makes a fool of himself, is to tell him so; and if you find that I am making a fool of myself, why for God's sake tell me so and quick. (Applause and laughter.)

Now, I want you to understand, after having made these preliminary complimentary observations (laughter), which I hope will have the desired effect of inducing you to express your dissent with appropriate emphasis when you differ from me, I want to say one or two words to you, as representatives of American labor.

I bring to you a message from Mr. W. R. Cremer, one of the oldest workingmen members in Parliament. (Applause.) He has often been to America. He was the man who first originated the idea of the Interparliamentary Union, and he received the Nobel prize and immediately gave it away for the purpose of promoting peace and arbitration, although he was only a working man. (Applause.) He desires me to say to you that he sends a message of heartfelt sympathy, and regrets very much that he cannot be here to speak to you himself. He would have been very glad to have been here, but Parliament is in session and he is an old man, going on eighty, but in heart and soul he is with you to-day. So much for the message with which I am charged.

Now, I want to say a few practical things. We have heard a great deal this evening of ideas that deal with war in the abstract, and peace in the abstract, and various other things. That part of the subject has been so very well and fully dealt with, you will perhaps pardon me if I venture to say one or two practical things.

We in England look to you in America to redeem your character and reputation, which have been very much battered of late years. (Laughter and applause.) There was a time, when I was a boy, when we looked to the great Republic of the West as the home of freedom, as the place where every working man had a fair chance to get to the top, where there were no great fortunes, where there were no peers, where there was no established Church—a land which was the home of liberty, the home of opportunity, the place for the laboring men of the world. Well, of late years that is not the kind of idea we have had of America. We may be mistaken, but what we have in our

country as the idea of America is that you have developed bigger fortunes than anybody else in the world; and judging from the speeches which I have heard from the lips of Mr. Carnegie, there is no greater misfortune that can befall any man than to be a millionaire. (Laughter.) And the growth of these enormous fortunes has made it very difficult for the small man to get to the top. The equality of opportunity which we used to think belonged to you, seems to have dwindled away; and in place of the passionate enthusiasm for liberty and freedom which we used to identify with your people, your sympathy for liberty and freedom throughout the world, we hear a great deal about graft—curious word that! (Laughter.) A word which I will not attempt to translate into my ordinary English, for fear I might make a mistake. (Laughter.)

We hear a great deal concerning the extraordinary methods of getting rich, what may be called, I suppose, legalized highway robbery. (Great laughter and applause.) In short, the fine old American ideal, in which I was brought up when I was a boy, has been very largely overclouded and eclipsed by things which I do not think you like any better than we do, but still there is in the American heart and in the American brain a great belief in the common man, the ordinary man, the ordinary woman.

There is one thing, almost the only thing that I find in your country in which you preserve somewhat the old idea of democracy; and that is this, that your waiter and your shoeblack, and your barber and your chambermaid all shake hands with you and talk to you as if you were all Dukes and Counts and Countesses together. (Laughter.) That is very pleasant to me, for it is a very fine lingering relic of the traditions of the good old time. But I must say that when many Americans come over to our country, they drop that good tradition very precious short and are much more exclusive than the English aristocracy itself. (Laughter and applause.)

What we want to do and what I am over here largely to ask you to do, is to ascertain whether it is possible for the American enthusiasm, the distinctly American democratic enthusiasm that believes in equality of opportunity, that believes in democratic government, that is not run entirely by bosses and governed by graft, which believes that all men are equal and

that all men should have a fair chance, and that differences, instead of being settled by the methods of the battlefield should be referred to courts—whether it is possible for that element to be brought into activity again. We want to revive the old American ideals before the peoples of Europe.

I can assure you, speaking from very wide experience in European nations, that the general opinion of Europe is that the American is a dreadfully smart man who has got a great deal of money, a man who is very unscrupulous as to the way in which he makes this money and very lavish in the way in which he spends it, and that his great object is to have a good time. That is the American in England, the American in Europe, the pleasure-seeking American, the American who has money to burn, who goes to Monte Carlo and Paris and all that—and that is the last man in the world to whom you should look for any ideal or any great enthusiasm.

I believe there is still enthusiasm, there is still faith in humanity on the part of the American people, and I want to get it manifested. I want it brought home to the people in Europe.

Now, there is one particular proposal with which I have been identified in England and which I wish to recommend to you as a sample of what we want to get done at the Hague Conference, and I want you to help to get it done. You know at the present moment that Monarchies—which you all despise, of course, I presume—as free-born Republicans—Monarchies have at least more common sense than Republics in one thing, and that is that Monarchies recognize the Monarchs. They recognize that because they are governing countries side by side with each other, it is very important they should be on neighborly terms; that they should not quarrel more than is absolutely necessary; that they should be a little chummy among themselves, visit each other, dine with each other, correspond with each other, and in short show hospitality to each other. Now, Democracies have never learned that fundamental lesson. We have democratized many things in the Old World and you have been a Democracy from the first, but you have never democratized hospitality; neither have we, but we hope to begin.

We have heard a great deal concerning the various Squires upon this platform to-night. (Laughter.) We in England always consider when a man sticks "Esquire" after his name, it

is a kind of intimation—unless the man is legally entitled to the word Esquire—that it is the mark of a snob. Plain “Mr.” is all right. Now you have crowned a lot of spurious Esquires; you will be getting some Knights, Dukes, Counts and Princes before long. But you have in your Labor Unions men who correspond to the old Dukes and Feudal Princes of old times. They are not hereditary leaders, but they are leaders. (Applause.) And they have got thousands and hundreds of thousands of men at their backs. But where is there a government in the world that will recognize Mr. Gompers as a Prince? Yet he is far more important than many of the tuppenny ha’penny Princes we have. (Applause.) We maintain that if we are going to inaugurate an era of democracy based on fellowship and Peace among the nations, we must practice hospitality to the leaders of democracy and especially to the leaders of organized labor.

You say, how can you do that? Very simply, my friends, if you’ve got two things: First, common sense and good-will; secondly, the money with which to do it. It is precisely to that question of money that I am coming now. Do you think it is reasonable that a government should try to maintain Peace only by preparing for war, instead of endeavoring to work for Peace by promoting peaceful sentiments among its people? We in England have studied this matter carefully, and we have come to the conclusion practically, that the time has arrived when every government in the civilized world should make an appropriation every year for the purpose of showing hospitality to other nations, and for the purpose of promoting Peace and good-will among its own people. And by way of beginning, it has been proposed that we should ask the governments of the civilized world at the Hague Conference to set aside, say, one red cent for Peace and hospitality for every ten dollars that they spend upon powder and shot. (Applause.) One red cent—decimal one per cent. of the army and navy appropriations—to be spent in promoting good feeling among the peoples by an interchange of hospitality.

Do you know how much that would mean in our country? It would mean that we should have about three hundred thousand dollars a year to spend in promoting Peace by promoting good feeling, good neighborliness, showing hospitality to the

representatives of the people, whether they be Trade Union leaders, Members of Congress, distinguished artists, men of science, any person who serves his country. These people ought to be received, ought to be welcomed, ought to be entertained. Now we want your support in your country to the proposition that instead of spending all your money to preserve Peace by making preparation for war, you should spend one dollar in every thousand upon the more practical methods of promoting brotherly love and kindly feelings among the peoples. (Applause.)

We want to get you to be really aroused on this question—which I am very sure of, because when a man gets really aroused, there is always more fight in him than there seems to be in the kind of meetings I have addressed. You know in war one of the things you have to do is to get in touch with your enemy by making a reconnoissance in force. By that means you feel out your enemy and know where to plant your shot in the midst of him. We have been making a great many reconnoissances in force, but I do not think we have drawn anybody's fire anywhere upon our movement except one miserable tupenny ha'penny person who seemed to think it was much better to use the soldiers against his own country than against a foreign foe. (Cries of hear, hear.) I am glad that one person approves energetically, but will nobody disapprove as energetically?

Now, if you are really going to work this business, you have got to set to work practically. How can you bring your feeling, your opinion, your convictions to bear upon the government? Only in one way, my friends. You must band yourselves together and make yourselves an intolerable nuisance to everyone who does not do what you want. (Laughter.) There is but one way of getting anything from any government and that is by making it uncomfortable for them not to go your way. (Laughter and applause.) Then make it more uncomfortable for them to go other peoples' way than yours. All the people who make money out of war, and supply war material, have an enormous mass of family interests in the army, in the navy, in those who are building ships—the bread and butter of these people depend on army expenditures, on navy expenditures, going on and going on; and if you do not band yourselves

together and make it very hot for people who do not do what you want, the organized interests which represent the expenditures will down you every time.

Now, there has been a great deal said about organized labor banding together. I am very glad that I can bear witness to-night that in England organized labor has stood the test and stood it very well on the subject of Peace and war. It is all very well to throw our caps up into the air when there is no war thunder heard, no madness in the population, but when we are in a war, where our own countrymen are fighting against a foreign foe, it takes a good deal of grit, a good deal of earnestness to stand up against your own government and denounce it, and expose yourself to the accusation of denouncing your own countrymen who are dying on the field of battle for the honor of your flag. (Great applause.) But all labor men—we did not have very many in Parliament then—were, with one solitary exception, I believe, absolutely as a unit against that abominable South African war. They stood as a rock and they had their reward. They went back to their constituencies, some twenty or thirty, and they came back nearly a hundred strong—a hundred labor members there are at present in the House of Commons—and Peace men every one of them. That is a good record. (Applause.)

But what we want you to do, the organized labor men of this country, is to back up the organized labor of European countries. We have a far greater burden of armaments than you have. The war pressure is far more keenly felt by us than it is by you. You are a great, free and practically unlooted country; your great treasures are unappropriated. You have only scratched the surface of the treasure house of the world in which you live. We are living in an old world. We want a fresh breath of the American enthusiasm to encourage us to keep on fighting. And so it is that I propose, and I hope on Friday night, when I am here to discuss more at length with you and in a more informal fashion than I am doing now, the proposal that representative Americans of international reputation—including a fair proportion of the representatives of organized labor, men whom I will venture to name in the provisional list which I submit, including Mr. Gompers, Mr. Mitchell, and Mr. Powderly—should be sent by peace-loving American

citizens as a deputation to Europe to appeal to the peoples of Europe, especially appealing to the organized labor of Europe, to join with them in making an appeal to every government in the Old World, to support a strong and a peaceful and a progressive program at the Hague Conference. (Applause.) I believe it would be a useful thing and a very admirable thing, if, instead of confining your export of traveling Americans to wealthy millionaires and society women, you would send some of the representatives of labor to meet the representatives of labor in other countries—I believe that if such a deputation made a pilgrimage, as I might call it, it would shake society and give new hope and courage to all those who are struggling for the right in the Old World.

The route that has been mapped out, for the delegation is to start from New York, after having waited upon the President and the Secretary of State at Washington; go to England, where they would be joined by twelve British pilgrims, see our King and our Government, see our representative men and make them see and understand that America is in earnest about this question. Then, adding the twelve British pilgrims to their number, they would go over to France and repeat the same operation there; and from France go on to Rome; from Rome to Vienna; to Buda-pesth; from there to St. Petersburg; and then return, stopping at Berlin, Brussels, and then on to The Hague, where the International Deputation, consisting of one hundred of the best and brainiest and most peace-loving citizens of the world, would lay before the President of the Hague Conference the prayer of all peace-loving citizens regardless of nationality. And at this great meeting of the Parliament of the world, the first Parliament of the world ever assembled, good use could be made of that deputation. Definite steps would be taken *first* to establish the principles of a peace budget, by which there should be a small appropriation made every year for the active work of the Peace Movement and the promotion of hospitality; *secondly*, for the excommunication, the placing under the ban of the world, every nation which went to war without first asking special mediation to see whether the quarrel could be adjusted amicably—allowing these special mediators thirty days' time in which to make Peace; *thirdly*, for an arbitration treaty to cover every question not of primary importance, but for secondary questions

not affecting vital interests, not affecting national honor, a treaty by which all nations shall bind themselves to refer all such questions to arbitration. Then lastly, they could appeal to the Conference to do something practical to stop the headlong race to ruin and perdition that is going on in the continual increase of the armaments of the world.

I know that there are some people who want to go in for a program of disarmament. My dear friends, I have no objection to anybody who wants to bring the Kingdom of Heaven down to this world by return of post. (Laughter.) It is an admirable thing to want to do, but a difficult thing to get done. And so the question of disarmament will not be discussed at this Hague Conference. If it had been proposed to discuss disarmament, many of the great powers would not have put their foot inside the Hague Conference. What will be discussed, thanks to the persistence both of Great Britain and America, will be the question whether or not it is possible for the next term of, say, five years, for the nations to agree not to increase their armaments beyond the point which they have at present reached. (Applause.) That would be the beginning, the first practical halt-step; after that, if we find that in five years we have not increased our armaments, that we have kept faith with each other, then we might perhaps simultaneously reduce our armaments, so that we would not alter the relative fighting strength between one power and another. But one thing at a time. Creep before you walk, walk before you run, and run before you fly; and if you will try, as the former speakers at this Peace Congress seemed to want to do, to start flying right straight up at once, you will only break your neck and you won't get a bit farther. (A Voice: Good!)

Now, my friends, I am very glad that I have had the opportunity of speaking to you just a little to-night, because I think I have given you a taste of my quality. (Applause and laughter.) My quality is the quality of a man who goes straight to his point, trailing his coat for somebody to tread on and very much disappointed when he cannot get anybody to disagree with him (laughter), because it is horribly monotonous talking to people that hold the same opinions.

A MAN: I disagree with you.

MR. STEAD: You do?

THE MAN: I do.

MR. STEAD: Good, good, good; come along. (Applause.)

THE MAN: I maintain, that in spite of all that you have said, there can never be permanent Peace under the present system of exploitation for profit. (Applause.) We know that. There is another thing in which I disagree with you.

MR. STEAD: May I just say one word before you go to the second point? May I ask you—

THE MAN: If you want, I will sit down. (Cries of Order! Order!)

MR. STEAD: Go on.

THE MAN: I did not mean to break up the meeting.

MR. STEAD: You are not breaking it up—you are livening it up.

THE MAN: The second thing, you want Mr. Gompers and these men when they go to England to be honored. Why do you say that those men who are upon the backs of labor are the leaders of labor? So far, the leaders of labor are not yet here. These men take advantage of our brutal ignorance to work upon it with their speeches. We are very ignorant and do not know our real leaders, yet you encourage us to show respect to these leaders you have spoken of. You talk about genius—We made the geniuses. (Cries of Order, Order). One of the speakers has mentioned Carlyle. But she did not read what he says about hero-worship. There is one more thing where I disagree with you. You have all ignored to-night what international socialism has done toward Peace. (Applause, and a voice "Good Boy!")

MR. STEAD: Now we are going to have some fun. (Applause. Laughter.) Now, in the first place the speaker who has just sat down said he disagreed with me. (Tumult and cries of "Order! Order!") I take one at a time. (Laughter.) He said that he disagreed with me because he said that nothing could be done to secure permanent Peace until the present organization of society for the exploitation for profit was done away with. I should like to ask that speaker, how he knows that I do not

agree with him. I said nothing to show that I did not. (Applause. Laughter.) Secondly, he says that Mr. Gompers and Mr. Powderly and Mr. Mitchell——

THE MAN: I did not mention Mitchell.

MR. STEAD: Well, I will accept the correction—that the people I mention are not the real leaders of the working classes of America.

THE MAN: No.

MR. STEAD: Well, my friends, I have a good deal of what you may call confidence, and I am ready to do a good many things, but I should not want to attempt to nominate the men who are the leaders of the working classes of America. The men composing the American Federation of Labor are capable of choosing the right kind of men, are they not? I wouldn't have the impudence to say that they were not, for I am a foreigner; I don't know. If you think that that organization of laborers of America are fools, you are entitled to your opinion, but, as an Englishman, I would not dare to say so. (Laughter. Applause.) There is a gentleman over there (the speaker pointing).

ANOTHER MAN: Answer the third question. The socialist movement.

MR. STEAD: Yes, I beg your pardon. I understood you to ask me whether international socialism had done anything to promote Peace? I think that international socialism has distinctly been a good influence in putting the fear of God into the hearts of the various nations. (Applause.) I think that the dread of the growth of socialism is the one terror which appeals to some persons who are very strongly in favor of going on with more and more military expenditures, to think once and twice and even thrice before they go farther in that direction. But may I give you one word of advice? I give it to you with the best goodwill in the world. Do not assume that a man disagrees with you until you have proof that he does. (Applause and cries of 'Hear! Hear!')

A MAN (in the left-hand corner of the hall): You're all right, Billy!

MR. BUCHANAN: As Chairman of this meeting I want to lay down the rules which govern these questions. Mr. Stead very graciously is willing to face any questions, and he has shown his ability to answer, but in the absence of the officials of the American Federation of Labor here, I will not tolerate any assault upon their reputations or character. (Applause. Cheering.) If you desire to ask any questions that involve principle, I am satisfied Mr. Stead will answer them, but you must not insult the American labor movement by impugning the motives of its leaders. (Applause.) I won't have it.

ANOTHER MAN: These men that Mr. Stead wants to send to Europe are, as a matter of fact, the leaders of the workingmen in America to-day. We know that. Whether they should be or not is another question. I am not going to say anything about that. I want to say that I differ with you, Mr. Stead. When you got up there at first, you said you were surprised that you could have talked so much at all these Peace Meetings and nobody ever come back at you. If you came to the Cooper Union meetings held here every week, you would find that at all these meetings we always get back at the speaker. And the only reason that you and the rest of the speakers up there to-night have it all your own way was because there were so many of you there. (Laughter.) We had to give you a chance. But I want to say this: that I thoroughly agree in some respects with my friend on the left. There is a force making for International Peace in the world to-day, and it has done more for International Peace than all the Hague Conferences held for the past seventy-five years. (A voice, "Good Boy!")

Chancellor von Bülow, of the German Empire, has stated distinctly that the greatest force making for International Peace in the world to-day is the international movement of the socialist party of the world. (Applause, and a voice, "Good Boy!") Chancellor von Bülow ought to know, because he was preceded by Mr. Bismarck, the man of "blood and iron," and that man of blood and iron tried to stop the socialist movement for ten years, but came to the conclusion that the best thing to do was to conciliate the socialist movement; and so he tried to conciliate it then, but it kept growing and growing all the time. And notwithstanding the fact that the international socialist

From Stereograph, Copyright 1907, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

A PEACE CONGRESS AUDIENCE

movement has done more for Peace than all the Hague Conferences that ever were held, there was not a single word said about it here to-night upon the platform. There was not a single person invited to speak who was known to be a socialist and who would speak upon International Peace from a socialist standpoint. (Applause and cheering and cries of "Good Boy!") I will tell you one more thing, and then I will be through. (Cries of "Order! Order! Sit down! Sit down!") Can I say—(A voice, "Say it!")—they were going to send an expedition from the German Empire to help the Czar of Russia to put down a rebellion in Russia, but the leader of the Social Democracy, August Bebel, told the German Emperor that if that fleet was sent, he would have trouble in his own domain. (Applause.) Almost the same thing happened in your own country when they were going to send a fleet out to shake hands with Russia, and if I recollect aright, your own labor members told them to keep that fleet away. Those are the things that are making for International Peace, and I tell you that they will make for International Peace. If that committee you speak about, that you would like to have visit England, if they were to visit there they would not be much needed, because we are going to send over about fifty now, and if those fifty men cannot do it, then your sixty men cannot do it. If those sixty that you have spoken about will go to President Roosevelt and in the name of organized labor of the United States demand that he shall not build any more battleships for another year and a half, until 1909, then they would have something to present to the other nations, who might follow in our wake. Unless something of that kind is done, nothing substantial will take place. (Great applause.)

ANOTHER MAN: I want to say with reference to the speaker of the evening and the first question, Mr. Stead wrote a book in which he described Chicago and the great Pullman Strike. Mr. Stead stated in that book that capitalism was not the evil from which the workingman suffered. So Mr. Stead cannot agree with the first questioner in regard to the first question, unless he has changed his mind since those days. I don't know. Mr. Stead stated plainly in that book that it was not capitalism from which the working class suffered. That was during the great Pullman strike in Chicago. I still have the book in my possession.

MR. STEAD: I should like very much to see that book. I do not remember the passage you refer to. I should be very glad to see it.

MR. BUCHANAN: I want to say that my attention has been called to the fact that the time at which the trustees of this institute expect these meetings to close has passed. Now, if this is permitted to go on, we shall be here until morning, because some people are willing to stay until morning to get in their questions and talk on the floor. We cannot permit this. Mr. Stead has been very generous in giving up his time in this way.

MR. STEAD: I like it, my friends. (Laughter.)

MR. BUCHANAN: Mr. Stead likes it, and we are glad he does like it, and we do not dislike it ourselves, but Mr. Smith will explain the situation.

MR. SMITH: The janitors of the building live at a considerable distance from the building, and they want to go home and get sleep so as to get up and do a day's work to-morrow.

MR. STEAD: One thing before you go.

MR. BUCHANAN: Mr. Stead wants a word in conclusion now.

MR. STEAD: On Friday night I am going to be here again.

MR. SMITH: Silence, so you can hear Mr. Stead.

MR. STEAD: I am going to be here on Friday night at eight o'clock, and I will give you a talk of an hour, and then we will have two hours of hoggey-boggey, and I hope that you won't be deterred by having so many on the platform. In fact, if you like, there shall be nobody on the platform but myself and the chairman. That will give you an opportunity for questioning, but I do hope that when we come to the questioning you will stick to the point and put definite questions, asking for information, and I will answer to the best of my ability. I look forward with great joy to our having a really good time Friday night. (Great applause.)

CONFERENCE FOR PEACE WORKERS

TABERNACLE CHURCH

Wednesday Morning, April Seventeenth, at 9.30

MRS. LUCIA AMES MEAD Presiding

MRS. MEAD:

I have great pleasure in opening this meeting, as it ought to be opened, with a word from that society which is the oldest peace organization in the world—the society founded by George Fox, the contemporary of Bunyan and Milton. We have as our first speaker, Mrs. Elizabeth Powell Bond, of New Jersey, the late Dean of Swarthmore College, and she comes representing the Society of Friends which has done so much for the cause of Peace—Mrs. Bond.

Friends as Promoters of Peace

ELIZABETH POWELL BOND

Any statement of the work of the Religious Society of Friends in behalf of Peace, is of necessity in some measure a history of the Society itself. The convictions of George Fox concerning war, so clearly in accord with the teachings of the New Testament, placed him at variance both with the commander of the Puritan army, and with the 37th Article of Religion agreed upon in the Convocation of the Clergy of the Church of England that "It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the magistrate, to wear weapons, and to serve in the wars." (Thomas Hodgkin's "George Fox," p. 41.) George Fox had pressed upon him a captaincy in the army of Oliver Cromwell, of which he says, "I told him I knew whence all wars arose, even from the lusts, according to James' doctrine; and that I live in the virtue of that life and power that took away the occasion of all war." (Rufus M. Jones' "Journal of George Fox," p. 128.) Later, when imprisoned in Lancaster on the charge of endeavoring "to raise insurrections to embroil the nation in blood" he

declared "my weapons are spiritual, which take away the occasion of war, and lead into Peace. . . . I was never an enemy to the King, nor to any man's person upon the earth. I am in the love that fulfils the law, which thinks no evil, but loves even enemies." (Rufus M. Jones, p. 348.) During his years of imprisonment in English jails, when he was almost wholly cut off from those in sympathy with his teachings, it is evident that he pondered deeply upon the very practical question of making most effectual the revelations to him of truth.

The plan of organization, formulated in the Rules of Discipline and Advices, reached every individual member within the fold, and established an unbroken chain of fellowship, of responsibility for one another, and of teaching concerning the fundamental principles of the Society. Thus it is that the message of George Fox to Cromwell's soldiers reached from the center to the circumference of the Society, permeating all its membership. In the several yearly meetings of the present day in which are met together the chosen representatives of all the subordinate meetings, there is always read this query whose answer literally takes cognizance of every individual member—"Do you maintain a faithful testimony in favor of Peace and Arbitration, and against war and the preparations for and excitements to it?" (Discipline of Philadelphia Yearly Meeting, 1894.)

There is not only this direct appeal concerning military service, but the teaching goes still deeper—to the very root of the matter. In a manuscript copy of the "Rules and Discipline" of 1676, possibly from the hand of George Fox himself, it is "Advised that Friends be tender to the Principle of God in All, and shun the occasion of vain Disputes and Janglings, both among themselves and Others; for that many times is like a blustering Wind, that hurts and bruises the tender Buds and Plants." In the latest issue of the Discipline of the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends (1894) there is detailed advice concerning the duties of arbitrators when differences arise between any of its members about property. "It is further earnestly advised that Friends do not go to law, particularly with one another. If, for any reason, one should think himself under necessity to bring an action against a fellow-member. let him consult the overseers or other judicious Friends before proceeding." Nor does the care of the meeting end here. In

every local meeting, thrice during the year, there are asked and answered for the information of the Yearly Meeting, these three searching questions, "Are love and unity maintained among you? Are tale-bearing and detraction discouraged? When differences arise, are endeavors used speedily to end them?" Here, we reach the very roots of war! There is a tradition that when the Egyptians prayed again and again to Osiris for release from a plague of crocodiles, deliverance came finally through the little ichneumon that diligently destroyed the eggs of the great reptiles. For more than two hundred years the Society of Friends has carried on this work against war, at its very roots. It has striven to abolish armies by teaching men to be makers of Peace. In every community where Friends are to be found, small though their numbers be, and creating no apparent ripple upon the surface of its life, this leavening principle of love has been at work. It may be that this work nearly hidden in the seclusion of a small company of quiet people has helped more than could be computed toward the establishment of Peace. William Penn's plan in 1693 for a European Council of Arbitration may have been the seed of the International Peace Congress at The Hague in 1899.

"Are love and unity maintained amongst you?" Who that loves his neighbor could trespass upon his rights; could encroach upon his boundaries; could enter into a quarrel with him; could go to war with him in the courts? "Are tale-bearing and detraction discouraged?" We disinfect our houses when there is a suspicion of diphtheria germs; not less poisonous is the habit of repeating ill reports of our neighbor—it makes the very food that the war spirit grows strong upon! "When differences arise is care taken speedily to end them?" How many times a calm word of explanation would take away all the sting of a "difference," and change haters into lovers! Think what it might be to the world if, in every church-service the world over—Christian, Hebrew, Mohammedan, Buddhist, there were incorporated with its declaration of creed this further declaration, "I believe that love and unity should be maintained among us. I believe that tale bearing and detraction should be discouraged. I believe that when differences arise, care should be taken speedily to end them." Think what it might be to the world if in every

home the world over, there were established this family altar to Peace!

It should be added, that while this radical work for Peace has been a distinguishing characteristic of Friends, it is also true that they have labored in behalf of arbitration and in co-operation with other Peace Societies. Nor have they escaped altogether in these latter days the test of persecution. During the Boer War members of the Rowntree family in Scarborough, England, invited Mr. Cronwright-Shreiner to give an address on "The Conditions of a Durable Peace in South Africa." This was construed into opposition to the government; and a mob visited retribution upon the Rowntrees in the destruction of their property to the amount of many hundreds of pounds and their narrow escape from severe personal injury. The address of these Friends to their townsmen shortly after the riot is worthy of their inheritance from those who paid with their lives the price of liberty of speech. In this address they said: "We wish to state that it is not our intention to make claim against the Borough Fund for property damaged or destroyed during the riot which occurred. Our convictions on some great questions are, we know, different from those of the majority of our fellow-countrymen; but for these convictions we must render our account not to men but to God."

The world fears that without the discipline of war, for obedience to command, and fearlessness on the battlefield, life would grow "flat, stale and unprofitable"; and that heroism would become atrophied. This need not be feared. Obedience to command is one of the disciplines of business and industrial life. So long as railroad engineers drive their engines at express speed through the darkness of night, and sailors guide their great steamships in the face of the tempest, manhood will not lose its schooling for noble courage. I have seen college boys, much given over apparently to the sportiveness of youth, cast fear to the winds at the sound of the fire-alarm, and mounting the peak of the roof of their science building, their soaked garments freezing in the wintry cold, and the fire threatening the timbers which were their support, stand at their post of danger till the flames were subdued.

It is a high-water mark of civilization that this memorable Congress is in progress. It has opened to us anew the vast field

for legislative and judicial action which waits the Conference at The Hague. And it has deepened our conviction that a great, availing service is delegated to each individual of us all in destroying the seeds and the roots of war by the nurture of those things that make for Peace.

MRS. MEAD:

We have among us, as you know, one great society which, with the Peace Society, has done much, at least among women of the United States, to promote the cause of Peace—the Women's Christian Temperance Union; and I have the honor of presenting to you this morning, as the representative of that society, Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey, of Maine, the Superintendent of the Peace Department of the National and International Women's Christian Temperance Union.

Woman's Place in the Peace Reform Movement

HANNAH J. BAILEY

It has been said that there is no important subject in which woman is not concerned. Certainly she has a place in the work for Peace and Arbitration. One of the most efficient lines of effort in which she can engage to promote the interests of this worthy cause is to help mould public opinion. Arbitration would be the only means resorted to in the settlement of national difficulties if people would always speak of it in as enthusiastic terms as they now often speak of warfare, and if they would cease declaring the world is not ready for it.

Mothers should teach their children that there is a higher form of patriotism than that whose aim is to destroy human life. They have too long taught that patriotism and military glory are synonymous terms. Probably there is no word made so susceptible of contradictory definitions as that one word "patriotism." "Through the use of it," as Mrs. Sewall has said, "appeals are often made to the lowest selfishness and the highest arrogance of the human heart." There is nothing in which the public needs revival of instruction more than in regard to this same quality, patriotism. If a woman really loves her country and is willing to live for it, and work for it, and to die working for it and for humanity, it does not follow that she believes that any wrong

should be overlooked. She simply claims that as she settles the children's disputes in her home, not in a haphazard way, but by reasoning with each, having a reckoning with those at fault, so should nations conduct themselves. When this time shall come——

"And sovereign law, the world's collected will o'er thrones
and globes elate,

Sits empress crowning good, suppressing ill,"

the Golden Rule can be applied to society, custom and law, and the beautiful Golden Age will dawn for "only the Golden Rule of Christ can bring the Golden Age of Man."

The first duty which we have is to conform our ideas to the highest desirable attainment possible, and to hold them there till the world shall be lifted to that plane by our patient purpose.

Someone has said, "War will never cease till woman finds herself. The spiritual power of the awakened woman-soul would quench the spirit of war as water quenches fire." The Woman's Christian Temperance Union is seeking to awaken women to an interest in this great work of helping to rid the world of its hydra-headed enemy—militarism. Its department of Peace and Arbitration was adopted at an annual convention held in Nashville, Tenn., in 1887, and the World's W. C. T. U. adopted the department two years later. Since then auxiliary departments have been organized in twenty-eight States and one Territory, and in fourteen foreign countries. Good local work on its lines of effort for the promotion of Peace principles has been done in all states and in all civilized nations. The department aims especially to promulgate these principles among women and children. It also sends Peace memorials to various conferences in this and other countries and secures the adoption of Peace resolutions in conventions and various religious and philanthropic organizations. It circulates petitions and sends protests and letters bearing upon the subject to the proper officials. It utilizes the public press as a potent agency. A very important part of its work is against military training in secular and Sunday schools. It aims to reach the children in the homes, the schools and the Loyal Temperance Legions, and to lift them to a plane where they will despise physical combat.

Many years ago thousands of children in Europe were enlisted in a crusade to Palestine with the hope of taking the

sepulchre of Jesus Christ from non-Christian people. This crusade forms one of the most cruel chapters of human history. Many of the boys and girls who entered it left their comfortable homes to suffer and to die on foreign soil.

The children of to-day are engaged in a nobler crusade—that of saving living humanity from the almost certain sepulchre of militarism toward which it is drifting. They can save the world from warfare which is a form of fratricide. They can bring about a time when there will be: “A parliament of man—a federation of the world.”

The World’s Woman’s Christian Temperance Union stands for the promotion of every moral reform. Next to the Temperance Reform, and closely in touch with it, is that of Peace as opposed to carnal warfare.

We have received reports the last year from twenty-three different countries. More general and local efforts have been put forth; more work accomplished; more peace sermons preached; public meetings with programs held; peace resolutions presented and adopted at conventions and conferences, and more personal work has been done and influence exerted for the promulgation of peace principles than ever before.

There is abundant evidence of a growing sentiment for Peace among nations all along the line. A sense of international justice is developing year by year, and we find the same regard for law which is found in civil society forcing itself into the relations of the world.

Our department of Peace and Arbitration is arrayed against lynching, capital punishment, carnal warfare, and every form of “man’s inhumanity to man.” We claim that to voluntarily take human life is overstepping the bounds of human authority, and should never be tolerated.

In those nations where the military life is regarded as the most important life, military achievements as the greatest achievements and military pursuits as the most honorable and fame-worthy pursuits, the advancement of women has been longest retarded; but where the military functions have become least significant women have the greatest freedom and the largest sphere of action. Christianity brought with it a respect for womanhood which the ancient world never knew.

Doubtless warfare can be abolished more easily and quickly by promulgating and advocating Peace principles and Arbitration than by considering the evils of warfare. It is better to crowd out the harmful by the good, to discuss the blessings of Peace more than the cruelties of war. Women can do much in training their children. There is great hope with them. If they are rightly trained in this generation, in the next generation the world will be at Peace, and the prophecy of Victor Hugo will be fully verified, that, "in the twentieth century war will cease."

There is much encouragement in the fact that large labor organizations, including many women, have declared against military burdens and tyrannies which affect them.

There is a resolute demand for the light of publicity on the causes of the quarrels of clans in the industrial world and for fairness in the adjustment of such troubles. These are some of the waves of a new era of human brotherhood in which "love shall tread out the baleful fire of anger and in its ashes plant the tree of Peace."

Thinking people throughout the civilized world are realizing as never before that love is the only power that can cement and bind together, and that hate, anger and fear are disintegrating forces, not only in the relations of individuals to their fellows, and nation to nation, but in the human system as well, medical science having now discovered that anger, grief and fear generate a poison in the system.

The Woman's Arbitration League and other organizations of women, besides the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, are exerting an influence in all the civilized world. They are promulgating the principles of Peace and Arbitration by the aid of the public press, by lectures, public meetings, mothers' meetings, children's organizations, distributing literature, circulating petitions, and by personal efforts with legislators and influential persons. They are sending petitions and also words of appreciation of good deeds to earthly monarchs, and are sending their appeals to the King of Kings, the Lord of Lords, the Prince of Peace.

Let us hope that the optimistic prophecies of many Peace advocates in this new century will come to pass, and let us work as if we hope, and in proof of our faith. If we do this some of

us may celebrate the glorious bloodless victory of Peace over warfare.

MRS. MEAD:

I am particularly glad that Mrs. Bailey touched upon this question of patriotism. I believe that the teaching of patriotism in the schools is very closely connected with this whole question of internationalism. Unless it is rightly taught, it will do vastly more harm than good. Our children have been in the past brought up to connect the idea of patriotism with a gun, and it is for the mothers and the teachers of to-day to recognize that there is no necessary connection between those two; that we have had Peace in this country nine-tenths of the time, and that only a tiny fraction, perhaps not more than 100,000 of all the eighty millions of people in this country are to-day under arms in our army and navy. It is an astounding thing that we allow a generation of young children to grow up fancying that patriotism is something that is peculiarly connected with the army and navy more than with the professional man, or business man, laborer, farmer or craftsman. We must endeavor to change this false emphasis and show that service of country is the duty of every citizen every month of every year. Good citizenship is the larger part of patriotism. Let us not think of it as a dull, tame duty, but ennoble it with all the honor that is attached to that sacred word—patriotism.

We have as our next speaker a lady who comes in a double capacity; she is connected with one of the New York school boards, and therefore can speak with authority as to what is being done in the schools in New York; she also comes as the representative of the Woman's Peace Circle of New York, which started before the present New York Peace Society. I have the great pleasure of presenting to you Mrs. Harry Hastings.

Peace in the Public Schools

MRS. HARRY HASTINGS

MADAM CHAIRMAN AND FRIENDS: It is my peculiar privilege to talk to you this morning as a New York woman representing the various women's societies in this state and city working for the Peace Movement. The ones which I particularly

represent are the Woman's Peace Circle of New York City, the Wm. Lloyd Garrison Equal Rights Association, and the New York State Woman Suffrage Association.

The Woman's Peace Circle, as it is an organization of this city, is, perhaps, of more immediate interest. It was organized by me in March, 1905, with the co-operation of Mrs. Arnold Schramm, and on the suggestion of Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, whom we have the honor to have acting as our chairman to-day.

The Woman's Peace Circle at once planned a Peace meeting, and this was accordingly held in the Madison Square Theatre on May 18, the anniversary of The Hague Conference. It was a very successful demonstration, largely attended and addressed by prominent advocates of the Peace cause.

Out of this public meeting has grown, I believe, an educational movement among the women here in New York in regard to the Peace Movement, of which before they had somewhat hazy ideas.

The Peace Circle has held regular meetings, again observed the anniversary of The Hague Conference in 1906, and intends to do so this year, also, at the Hotel Astor on the evening of May 18.

It has given its special attention recently to the education of the public in regard to the Fourth of July celebration. The President of the Peace Circle, Mrs. Benedict, is greatly interested in having a more rational method of observing the anniversary of the nation's independence, and has carefully studied the question, and has shown, very clearly, the devastations in life and property all over the country on that day due to the use of toys, firearms and fireworks generally. It is planned eventually to interest the various woman's organizations in some practical plan to discountenance this barbarous method of expressing our feelings on the Fourth of July. This society also has written to the State Superintendent of Education as well as the City Superintendent requesting exercises in the schools in commemoration of The Hague Conference on May 18.

The Wm. Lloyd Garrison Equal Rights Association, as the honored name it bears would indicate, stands for Peace in all the relations of life and is most particularly interested in the Peace cause.

It has already held a Peace celebration this spring at the Martha Washington Hotel, and was addressed by one of the Executive Committee of the present Congress, Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer (applause), who has done such glorious service in order to make this great Congress a success, her subject being "Woman and Militarism." Prof. Ernst Richard, of Columbia University and President of the German-American Peace Society, and Mrs. Rachel Foster-Avery, Secretary of the International Woman's Suffrage Association, also spoke on various features of the Peace Movement. Mrs. Mead, our Chairman, referred to me in her introduction as a local school board member of this city, and has suggested that I say a few words in regard to working for Peace in our public schools. Miss Addams very truly said in her address yesterday that in order to do away with the ideals of war we must substitute the ideals of Peace.

The constructive policy of Peace, however, is a very difficult one for educators in the face of the intense grasp on the young mind of that of war. Moreover, just now, with the advent of this purpose to inaugurate a constructive policy which must carry with it, perforce, the destruction of the methods and aims of warfare, there is a very recent but widespread movement all over our country, that perhaps you are not aware of, to perpetuate and emphasize militarism with its spectacular and hence most attractive glory.

I believe myself this is due to the peculiar characteristics of our President, Mr. Roosevelt, and it would not be very far from the truth to denominate him, in spite of his services in the cause of Peace, the pacificator militant. We must all admit that his influence in the direction of exalting the spirit and glory of war is felt strongly throughout our country. I would not quite say that the result of this is to arouse a warlike spirit in the youth of our land, but it certainly arouses in them a strong admiration for war ideals.

How far this contemporary spirit of military glory and display is carried you may well understand by the recently issued prospectus of the Jamestown Exposition.

Two days ago I received a little pamphlet from the press of the Jamestown Exploitation Committee of the Ter-centennial Exposition. It was sent to me as an educator, and I was besought as such to bring it to the attention of the children of the public

schools, and as far as I had any influence have them consider the educational value of the Jamestown display.

This prospectus is the little pamphlet which I hold in my hand, and I will quote directly from it.

One of the first paragraphs brought to my attention is the one explaining the war exhibit, on which is laid the greatest stress. It reads: Twenty foreign nations will participate in this military exhibition by sending war vessels from their navies and crack regiments from their armies.

Now, of course, the foreign governments were directly invited to do these things, for it involves such an enormous expense that no government would volunteer to send these exhibits.

We are further told in this prospectus that there is a war museum maintained by the government in connection with the military and naval display.

"In the war museum models of fortifications and harbor defences and types of batteries on embankments will be shown."

Furthermore, there is an exhibit of the ordnance department, which "will be a complete exhibition of firearms and powder. The largest cannon and the smallest firearms will be shown. Various styles of machine guns will be exhibited. Cartridge-making machines will be operated. Every variety of automatic *death-dealing device* will be exhibited," etc.

Again, what we have known hitherto in the world's fairs as the "Midway," the "Pike," etc., will at Jamestown be known as the "Warpath," thus further emphasizing the show as a military one. To increase the military attractiveness of the exposition, we are told "there will be much splendid musical entertainment of a military character, as the warships and regiments will have bands which will, of course, discourse war strains."

Thus in every way and from every side there will be presented to the youth and children of our land, who may visit the exposition, the glory and glamour of war and its enticing spectacular splendors, and yet we as educators are requested to see, if possible, that this symposium of war material and "death-dealing devices" in their highest exploitation shall be brought to the attention of our children in the public schools!

I have with me also a "Report on Rifle Practice in the Public Schools." Maybe we can influence this directly, although

I feel when I hear so much about the influence of women being put to work to carry out certain ideas, that as women we cannot do very much when they tie us hand and foot and then bid us get up and walk; so that often we may talk and talk until our tongues are numb (applause) without either influence or result.

This report I have referred to is a very grave indication of the insidious movement toward militarism. It is issued by the authority of and from a department of the Federal Government. It details the work of the National Committee that has been formed for the purpose of considering the possibility and advisability of some policy to inaugurate a system of rifle practice in the schools throughout the country. Our own high schools are now in practical possession of such a system through its sub-target gun-machine practice.

One of the commissioners of this National Committee is a member of our City Board of Education. He is a very able man, who has done a tremendous work for and with the athletic work in our schools.

There is no question that he deserves every credit and honor that can be given anyone who sees an opportunity to do good and puts that opportunity into practice; but he is, above all, a military man deeply interested in rifle practice and connected with the Creedmore Rifle Range, which has been one of his pet hobbies for many years.

Now, if there is one thing more than another that public school trustees and commissioners, and the people generally, have hitherto opposed in the schools it is the introduction of any military tactics for the purpose of discipline. Our discipline is, I hope, and will continue to be, founded on ethical principles.

The fact that the rifle practice is supported by private contributions does not make it any less harmful. This perversion of educational ideas has so far made its way into our boys' high schools, that each has already a rifle-shooting club, with a sub-target gun-machine installed by private munificence. There are regular competitions between the various clubs, and very handsome trophies are awarded by various citizens.

But more than all other encouragement is the promise of the President of the United States to write a personal letter to every boy who has obtained a Marksman Badge of a certain order.

What stronger incentive can be given to the boys to join these rifle practice clubs whose membership, as yet, is purely voluntary?

Mark you, though, one of the things that is said to induce educators to introduce the system generally into the schools in our city is that as the boys play on the streets and form gangs for various nefarious purposes, we, therefore, should give the children another idea which may induce them to form themselves into companies of a military nature! The statement about gangs in this report is somewhat misleading, for this gang tendency only obtains in a certain quarter of our city, and the children who so fraternize are entirely too young for any kind of rifle practice.

Friends, these reports are to be had for the asking, and I feel I can do nothing more practical for our Peace work than to ask you to study this report, using your own intelligence, and ascertain for yourselves if in the concluding utterances of the commissioner, when he says that at the call of war we will have 7,000 sharpshooters from the public schools ready to bear arms, you do not find a direct and unmistakable military spirit inciting to warlike feeling. The brutalizing effect of this rifle practice in the schools, if it becomes general, is only a question of time; its antagonism to the Peace Cause is indisputable.

MRS. MEAD.

I have allowed Mrs. Hastings to go over time because I think she has the most important subject that is presented here this morning.

I want to say in regard to rifle shooting clubs that when the Mosely teachers were here this winter I learned from them that not one free school in England has introduced rifle shooting. I do not know of any country in the world that taxes its people to provide rifle practice for school children. There are certain endowed schools in England that have adopted the methods proposed by Lord Roberts, but I do not know of any country in the civilized world except ours in which a proposition that the people shall tax themselves to train their children in the art of killing has been advanced. It has not yet been done by the people's money in the City of New York. I think Mrs. Hastings did not explain that thus far the cost has been provided

by private subscription, but when it comes to taxing the people to do this it will be a step that, as I said, no other nation has found it necessary to take. It seems to me if the time ever comes when our school boards shall tax the people for such a purpose it will be an indication of timidity and fear which is most discreditable to this great, strong country, which has not an enemy in the world. Up to date we have not been afraid of any nation, and we may well ask why it is that to-day when we rank so high as a naval power we should be so alarmed, whereas twenty years or fifty years ago, when we had no navy worth mentioning, we had no such fear of foreign foes?

I wish there was time to say something adequate regarding a subject which I barely mentioned in my address yesterday—a subject to be of immense importance in the future—namely, “Neutralization.” How much anxiety and suspicion, destined to estrange two continents, could be avoided if we could simply neutralize the Philippines, as was proposed in Congress by Senator Crane, just as Belgium and Switzerland are neutralized; this should not be, as in their case, by the consent of a half dozen nations, but by consent of all the nations of the world. If our government would petition all the nations to neutralize those exposed and sensitive localities which would perhaps require \$500,000,000 to adequately fortify, we could probably have their security guaranteed by mutual consent. This, as a naval official has said, would enable us to reduce the navy of the United States one-half. Please remember, ladies, that arbitration is not everything, that there are other methods of providing substitutes for war and for preventing the causes of friction.

We have as our next speaker a lady who hardly needs an introduction to an American audience. When I told her the other day that it was a very singular thing that every woman invited to speak at this Congress was a woman suffragist, she replied, “It is not strange, because every progressive woman nowadays is a woman suffragist.” I have pleasure in presenting Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt.

American Leadership

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

MADAM PRESIDENT AND LADIES: My understanding of the object of this meeting this morning is to determine the ways and

means by which we women may help this great cause of Peace and Arbitration upon its onward way. I dare say there is no woman here this morning who will not entirely agree with me when I say that war is far too barbarous to have any place in this Twentieth Century. One of our great papers has said during this Congress that even to hope for Peace throughout the world is impracticable; but to my mind the most impracticable method of settling any kind of dispute is by the wasteful process of war. I believe that we women who are here, at least, have all along been of this opinion, and we have needed no great Peace Congress with its eloquence and its logic to convince us of it. I believe the majority of the intelligent reading women of our country would believe this quite as much as we; but certainly it is true that most of our American women do need to read and be educated upon this subject to realize the necessity of working for this cause.

When the temperance advocates desire to make converts they discover that it is with difficulty that the woman who has never known the shame and humiliation of drunkenness in her own family can be aroused to work. It is the woman who knows the horrors of drink who is the earnest and devoted advocate. So when we appeal to American women to work for the cause of Peace, we appeal to those who know almost nothing of the horrors of war. Many of us from our earliest life, or even from the time we were born until we shall die, will never have a soldier in our family, probably not in our circle of acquaintances; we may travel over the land for days and never see a soldier. We have none of the dread of war. Nature has made the strongest possible fortifications for our nation. With the great Atlantic and Pacific Oceans on the East and on the West, the smaller and friendly nations to the North and the South, we know nothing of the fear that comes to the military nations of the world. There is no dread of war among us and consequently we do not realize the necessity of Peace. We know nothing of the conditions upon the other side of the great oceans; there it is very different. Every little nation, and the majority of the European nations are little nations, stand, not periodically, in dread of war, but perpetually; never free from dread, day or night. Every one of them believes that perhaps in the future its national life will be suppressed by one of the great military nations. When Norway

decided to become a monarchy and to have a king, it did so with the explanation by its leading people that it did not dare to become a republic lest Germany should not so much respect its military rights. And wise men in Holland say that if the present Queen shall die without an heir, they will gladly make their country a republic. But they are of the opinion that perhaps Germany will not respect the military power of the republic as it has the Dutch monarchy.

On the other hand, Germany, which is to-day the dread of all the smaller countries of Europe, has been driven into militarism by the necessity of self-defense. For centuries it was overrun by marauding tribes until little by little it was forced to unite and to become a great military power. And now all of Europe stands armed to the teeth; England and Germany and Russia and Turkey, the four great military nations, standing in dread of each other, and the little nations standing in dread of the big ones. Conscription enters into the homes of all of those countries and takes out of those homes the best blood within them. You cannot go anywhere without seeing soldiers; they are omnipresent. One is made to feel the moment he sets foot upon European soil that militarism is the basis of all the laws and institutions.

You may say, then, since Europe knows so well the horrors of war why does it not arise and demand Peace? It is because every nation is distrustful of every other one, and you may say, why do not women arise? Because European women are not free as we are to condemn the government. We can call the President of the United States by any name we wish, and nobody cares; but in foreign lands let a woman attack the government, let her attack one of its most favored institutions, and she finds herself ostracized in society; she finds herself perhaps even condemned by the suspicion that she has become an ally of some rival country. We in America have little appreciation of that condition.

It has been said in this Congress time and again that it is the province of the United States of America, because it is a peaceful nation, to take the initiative in matters at The Hague; and I say to you, my sisters, that it is the duty of American women to take the initiative in the education of the world among women, because we do live in a peaceful nation (applause);

because we American women are free to work; because the cause of Peace is popular with us; nobody can be criticised; nobody can sacrifice or fear anything who stands for it. Foreign women look to the American women for leadership. They believe we are cleverer than they. They know we have more freedom to work, and they are willing to follow the leadership of American women, as they are not willing to follow the leadership of the women of any other country, because their governments are in entire Peace with ours, and so I say to you that it is the duty of American women to stand as the leaders in this great work of Peace. Let each of us, therefore, become an organized individual peace society, and in the church and in the school and in the home, let us stand for it until we have so aroused the public reason, as Felix Adler called it, that the whole nation shall insist that our government must take the initiative all along the line. We need to stand for more than the mere abolition of war. We need to stand firm for International Peace, but we need to stand for Industrial Peace in order that there shall be the abolition of standing armies in the future, and we women can afford to stand for this. Let us demand its entire abolition in all our education and work. If the 50,000 club women in the one city of New York will take it up, if the women in the churches will take it up, we shall, within two years, have made such a sound in behalf of the cause of Peace that it shall be heard all the way around the world and it will become an established fact before we even dare to dream of it. (Applause.)

MRS. MEAD.

Friends, this lady is not on the program, and she is not going to speak; but I want you to know that this is Fraülein Eckstein, one of the directors of the American Peace Society, and a teacher who is this year spending every spare cent of her income printing and mailing all over the world these petitions to the heads of the nations. I will read this petition and she will be at the rear of the hall with other copies as you go out, and, if you are willing, please take, each one of you, a copy and get as many signatures as possible, and send to her; she plans to go herself to The Hague to present the petitions. It is as follows. (Petition for treaty to refer all difficulties to arbitration read by the Chairman.) Ladies, this is one useful thing that you can easily do.

I now have great pleasure in presenting to you the Rev. Anna Howard Shaw, President of the National American Woman's Suffrage Association, and Chairman of the Committee of the International Council of Women. We had hoped to give her more time than any other speaker and regret that she also must be limited to ten minutes.

Women's Responsibility in the Peace Movement

REV. ANNA HOWARD SHAW

Many years ago a woman in our country went forth to battle. She armed herself with a hatchet; she entered one saloon after another, destroying the furniture and making herself a general nuisance to the community. One of the New York papers at once wired Miss Anthony: "Telegraph to the paper your opinion of the action of this woman, and is this what the Women Suffragists of the United States are after?"

Miss Anthony immediately replied: "There are two forms of offense and defense; one is the method of barbarians; the other is the method of civilized men. There are two forms of weapons by which we may defend ourselves; one is the weapon of barbarism; the other is the weapon of civilization. The hatchet is the weapon of barbarism, the ballot the weapon of civilization." (Applause.)

The Association which I represent in this Peace Movement is a Peace Association, because it stands for arbitration; that is all that it means, the right of the people, the whole people, to arbitrate their difficulties at the ballot box, and this association has demanded this form of arbitration from the beginning, in the hands not only of the men but of the women of the nation as well. When the women of the world, when the women of the United States may stand as an integral part of the government of the United States and have power to go to the ballot box and there decide questions of Peace and war, then they will have power accompanied by that form of responsibility which always makes power safe, and the one who holds it conservative in her action.

We have been told from the very beginning of this Congress that women have a tremendous power and force in influ-

encing war and Peace. They have, but there is no more dangerous force in all the world than that exercised by a part of the people who have power and yet who are not held responsible for the manner in which they use it. Though women have had the power to inspire war, to inspire what we call patriotism, which makes men go forth to battle, and though it is the courage of the woman which incites to fight, yet the woman has only the influence to inspire that in which man has already taken the initiative. She can inspire and encourage his action; she cannot control the conditions before or after, nor is she held responsible for the results. If we could only add to the influence of woman the responsibility which would follow her action in active participation of deciding whether there *shall be* Peace or war, *then* we would back up the influence of women in this country with a power which would make her conservative and a mighty force for Peace. So we stand in our organization demanding that women shall have the power to sit in the Councils of State and bring into them the woman's thought, the woman's heart, the woman's responsibility, and when this is done then we will have a real, practical force in the women of the country in the interests of Peace; because women will think twice before they vote their sons to death. (Applause.) Women will think twice before they lay upon the nation the terrible burdens which follow war. Women will think twice before they will be the inspiration of a, in many respects, false patriotism.

When the Spanish war was on every other household in our block hung out flags. We did not hang out a single flag from our house. We were questioned in regard to it; I answered: "When the war is over we will raise the flag." I believe the time when the flag should be raised, the time when the flag should inspire patriotism, is not in time of war, but in time of Peace, in order that there may be no war.

We have a false idea of patriotism which has influenced many of our people. "My country right or wrong"—how many of us heard that expression two years ago! One man said: "The right kind of patriotism is to stand by your country under all conditions, 'my country right or wrong.'" I said to him: "A man who could make such an utterance as that has never known the first principles of patriotism." A real patriot says: "My

country if she is right, but if she is wrong, then by every power of my being will I seek to make her right."

"I prefer my family to myself, I prefer my country to my family, but I prefer humanity to my family," is the highest form of patriotism,—or that of the Persian sage, who said: "Think not thou art a patriot when thou canst say, 'I love my country only,' but rather know that thou dost not understand what patriotism is until thou canst say, 'I love my kind.'"

That form of patriotism will never enter into the hearts of the people of a nation until the mothers of the nation, the teachers of the nation (seven-tenths of whom are women) shall become an integral part of its life and a factor in determining Peace or war, between the nation in which they may live and the nations beyond their portals. Therefore I claim that if our association is not a Peace Association it is at least a very close relation to a Peace Association, for it is an arbitration society.

MRS. MEAD.

We have now as our last speaker Miss Sevasti N. Gallispéri, representing the Department of Education of Greece. She was the first woman to receive the degree of Bachelor of Arts from the University of Athens. With the degree she went to the Sorbonne in Paris, taking the degree of *License-ès Lettres*, the only woman among 127 men competitors and standing eighteenth among the thirty-nine that succeeded in getting the degree. Upon her return to Athens the Parliament of Greece gave her the position of Inspector of Public Schools and this position she has held for ten years without salary. She now comes to this country commissioned by the Minister of Education to study our educational methods. I have great pleasure in introducing Miss Callispéri.

I am very sorry that we have not a half hour longer to give to all the people who would like to speak. I am specially sorry that we have not time to hear President Martha Gielow of the Southern Educational Association, who asks for three minutes, but we have not one moment to spare, as the other meeting in Carnegie Hall opens in ten minutes. We must have, however, one minute to give Mrs. May Wright Sewall about the Jamestown Exposition.

The Symbols of Peace

MISS SEVASTE N. CALLISPERI

DEAR LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: No words can tell you how thankful I am to God who brought me to America, where I see in its best so much of the best that my Greek ancestors had; and how grateful I am to my parents—both gone—who by the education they gave me are the cause of the happiness I feel to-day, because I can address such an audience, and because the voice of an Athenian is heard in the Tabernacle Church. It seems to me of good omen that all we American women and foreigners meet in a church of this name, being sure that as the Laws of Moses were kept in the Tabernacle, so the words that will resound in this Tabernacle Church, and our oath to Peace, that we certainly all give now, will be faithfully kept in the Tabernacle of woman's heart.

Looking on so many calm, bright and intelligent faces shining with inner Peace in daily life, and with the fervent desire to bring Peace among the nations, we may be proud to be women. Now are realized the worlds of Paul:

"There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

Two great civilizations full of divine spirit, Judaism in which the founder of our religion chose to become incarnate, and Hellenism through which was extended all that was good in an incomparable measure; the one at the restoration of nature after the deluge, the other in picturing the victory over warlike force, both of those civilizations have chosen our sex to be messengers of Peace, and both Minerva and the Dove brought to humanity the same emblem, the olive leaf, which is characteristic of the life which religion and philosophy—that is the experience of centuries—wish humanity to live.

As the wild bird that brought in her mouth to Noah's Ark the leaf of the olive tree, as a sign of the end of the deluge, is considered to belong to our sex, so the Deity that vanquished Neptune, who had disputed with her the possession of Attica, by bringing forth that beautiful and proud animal which bears man fearlessly to the war, and dies with him like a faithful friend, that Deity I say, who took hold of its reins and checked its

martial spirit, has been invested with the personality of a woman. Minerva was considered to be the patron of the naval arts because she is said to have taught Danaos, leaving Egypt, to unfurl the sail and to have surveyed the construction of the ship Argo. She is represented on the coins sitting on the prow of that ship guiding its course. Though that Goddess was considered also the Goddess of War because she inspired the heroes, and protected them with a calm and thoughtful courage so that they might oppose the blind and senseless fury of Ares, the God of War, still she was principally known as Minerva working—Athena Ergani—that is the Deity who above all presided over all female manual work.

She was the incomparable artist who wove and embroidered for the Gods splendid robes trimmed with admirable designs. But this female deity was considered to be connected with many physical elements, and is thought by those who possess the mysteries of Sanscrit to have been the Goddess of the morning and of the lightning.

Still this female Deity presided also over the works that seem rather belonging to man. Therefore she was called too Athena Agrotera, namely, Minerva of the Fields.

In Thessaly and Bœotia, two great and fertile parts of Greece, where there are also luxuriant pastures, she was considered to have taught men to yoke the oxen. So she was the Goddess that presided over agriculture—that is the very root of life—over those works that are most apt to form the mildest character and bring peace to the soul.

The Athenians attributed to her the culture of the olive tree in which consisted the principal fortune of the Athenian valley, the fruit of which brings abundance to domestic life, gives that liquid which is the sweetest and most fortifying, and which lessens all pain, and the branch of which is the emblem of all pacific character.

So the Goddess of wisdom wants her followers to work—she loves the country and agricultural life, and is the patron of domestic economy which secures the honor and happiness of life. And are not these attributes of Minerva ratified by the best examples of history? Is not the return of Cincinnatus to his plow, the lesson that the best leaders are those who can limit

their ambition, and who, after they have fulfilled their duty, know how to leave the place to others and retreat to private and honest and peaceful life? Let all women make her attributes their own attributes and inclinations. This can only be obtained through education. "Education must bring to light the ideal of each individual," said John Paul Richter, and such a life can hardly be obtained without an education which will enable each child of both sexes to discover and cultivate his own inclinations and aptitudes, an education equally divided between the culture of the heart and mind through religion and philosophy, the scientific culture of the body and the scientific study of agriculture in all its branches.

"I was always of the opinion that humanity would be reformed if the education of youth were reformed," wrote Leibnitz to Placcius.

We women hold the world in our hands because God has destined us to be the educators of humanity. It is in our hands to give nobility to humanity; but we must first imbibe it ourselves.

According to the mythology, how was the Goddess Athena born? She sprang from the head of Jove. Is not this the lesson that every young woman must learn, and the principle that must guide her from the first moment that she is called to fulfil the very first duty of motherhood? That the being to whom she is to give life must be an intellectual one, not one of mere flesh and blood—that she has to nourish the mind and soul of that being by feeding her own mind and soul with the noblest thoughts that knowledge may afford, and that she should continue this education even when her children shall have grown to manhood and womanhood?

It behooves us at this present time to give to our girls lofty ideals of motherhood. They must fit themselves to give to the world men and women of lofty characters, of intellectual strength, governed by their ideals, not by their passions. We need to teach the world that to give to the nation strong, upright, loyal citizens, is more worthy of praise than to engage in the murderous pursuits of war.

Education is the great factor that will change the state of humanity. The axis of that education must be religion—rational religion with her companions, justice and truth, and love of work.

"It is a heaven upon earth where a man's mind rests in Providence, moves in Charity and turns upon the poles of Truth," said Bacon.

Is the cause of war any other but the ambition and insatiability of the so-called great, under all sorts of pretexts?

Let the children and youth of both sexes learn the beautiful lesson that is given to us by the aspect of the sheep feeding in the fields. They are near each other; they all eat the grass of the earth, but they do not jostle each other. Is not this picture a lesson that God provides for all, and is not that the sweetest lesson of Peace?

If we have Peace in every-day life we will have it among nations. Think of the horror of the white snow, which was made for the calm of purity, polluted with the blood shed by ferocity. I felt the grief of this thing when two years ago, while inspecting the schools in Thessaly, the snow lay three feet thick upon the valleys, and the mountains; every roof, and every twig upon the trees was veiled in white, the sight brought calm into my soul; then I could not help thinking of the plains of Manchuria covered with the same mantle of purity, but with its beauty and calm destroyed by the blood and mangled bodies of human beings. We all know more or less the evils of war, and we all feel what the presence and the sound of the footsteps of our own mean to us. How happy we feel when we hear them. Let us all think what they feel who see or hear no more the steps of those who for the ambition and rapacity of some are gone forever.

When Pericles the Great was dying he was surrounded by his friends, who were weeping and praising all the great works he had done; he interrupted them, saying: "You pass by my best deed. I never caused anyone to shed tears."

Would it be a small task for women throughout the world to educate men so that they might every one of them say: "No parent will be childless, no wife a widow, no child an orphan—nor will any weep through us?"

Would it not be a great thing if women throughout the world might be educated so as to feel strongly in themselves and inspire in men the words of Antigone: "I am born and exist in order to love, not to hate."

A literature is hardly understood without its own language. There is no literature so well calculated to uplift the mind and the heart of man and woman as the Greek literature, because it expresses the noblest of human thought and feelings, nor is there a language more divine or musical than the Greek language. While the young people everywhere spend so much time learning to tap on the piano, to dabble in colors, and utter nonsense in different languages, schools make the Greek language optional. Yet its strong, noble and delicate spirit, along with its harmony, has civilized humanity and might keep on civilizing it. I express the wish that it should become compulsory. Its power may be seen in the regeneration of modern Greece, the spirit of which may be seen in its emblem, its flag, as you all saw it trimming most splendidly the hall of the Peace Congress. It bears the most peaceful colors; the blue of the Greek sky, the white, and on the right top of its stripes a white cross, the emblems of purity, strength and sacrifice.

Let us be like Noah's dove carrying the olive leaf. It is said that the voice of the People is the voice of God; I say that the voice of a true woman is the voice of God. There was once a philosopher who had a small cottage behind which was a narrow strip of land with a single tree, and a bench under it. He was always telling his friends what a fine, large place he had to read and think in. One of these friends visited him one day and was astonished to behold only a humble cottage and instead of a garden a single tree. He said nothing, but the philosopher understood, and pointing to the broad expanse of the sky, he said, "All this is mine."

I wish, dear ladies and gentlemen, that we all might, like that philosopher, be content with little; then Peace will be on earth. Visit the land of all good and calm and Peace and take from the Valley of Athens a slip of the olive tree and plant the tree of Peace in your gardens. Teach your children under its shadow the lesson of Peace and let it be the emblem of the tree of Peace that will grow in your hearts.

MRS. MAY WRIGHT SEWALL:

MRS. PRESIDENT AND LADIES: I should have liked to add something to what has been said as a suggestion of what our

mothers might do in opposing the introduction of rifle practice in our schools.

I should also have liked to speak on the method of inculcating the spirit of internationalism which necessarily must permeate the world. But in the few moments I have I will only tell you, with the hope of securing aid of all kinds from you, that the National Council of Women has the interesting position of hostess for the women of the world at the Jamestown Exposition during months of that Exposition, a house having been placed at our disposal. The Chairman of the Committee in charge of the work which the National Council of Women will do is Mrs. Kate Waller Barrett. There is also a board of hospitality for the entertainment of the women of other countries. I am a member of her committee, and as the Chairman of the Peace Committee of the National Council of Women, and formerly President of both the National and International Councils, it is thought that we may perhaps form a link between the women of our own country and the women of all other countries. I shall devote myself to the concentration of efforts upon ways in which this meeting at Jamestown may be made an opportunity for furthering both local and international Peace projects. I feel that just the announcement of this should give to you some added interest in anything which you may do in regard to it, and it also gives me an opportunity to place this statement in the printed volume of the transactions of this Congress. It is for the women of the world (and when I say the women of the world, I am by no means reflecting upon the men of the world) to do something for Peace at the Jamestown Exposition, that it may be one of the means of cancelling the influence of the immense naval display which is being made at the Exposition for the advancement of the interests of militarism.

MRS. MEAD:

We now have a very important question and we shall go as rapidly as possible to the next conference.

At the close of the meeting Mrs. Gielow asks that there be placed upon the records a memorandum that Mrs. Martha Gielow, of Alabama, a delegate from her association to the Peace Congress, brings this message, that the removal of ignorance is the first step toward Peace. Mrs. Gielow has just returned from the

Educational Convention at Pinehurst, where she represented her association. Some of the great educators who heard her speech said that the work of this society was destined to fill a mighty part in the advancement of the country. It is entirely for the up-lift of the illiterate in the rural districts of the South.

From Kinocograph, Copyright 1907, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

PROP. HUGO MÜNSTERBERG
EDWIN GINN

ARCHBISHOP JOHN IRELAND
HON. JOHN W. FOSTER

DR. WILLIAM H. MAXWELL
SEÑOR DIEGO MENDOZA

CONFERENCE OF DELEGATES
DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS
CARNEGIE HALL

Wednesday, April Seventeenth, at 11.30 a.m.

GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY Presiding

MR. PEABODY:

I am requested to call to order this meeting of delegates from various organizations to the Peace Congress.

Dr. Trueblood, of Boston, Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, will read the resolutions which have been prepared.

A time limit of five minutes will be placed upon those who speak on the report. I think you will all recognize how advantageous for you this will be.

I now have pleasure in introducing Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood, of Boston, Secretary of the American Peace Society (applause), who will submit to you the resolutions which have been prepared by the committee.

DR. TRUEBLOOD:

MR. CHAIRMAN: The committee appointed by the Executive Committee of the Congress to prepare and submit a set of resolutions have done their work the best they could. They have labored under some difficulties, one being the natural rush and hurry of an occasion like this. Still greater difficulties have arisen from the fact that several of those who have presented resolutions have only handed them in yesterday afternoon, or this morning, after the committee had practically completed its work. We have tried to give respectful attention to all the resolutions handed us. These resolutions, so far as not incorporated substantially in our report, will be placed in the hands of the Secretary of the Congress for whatever use, in the printed proceedings, that the Executive Committee may see fit to make of them.

Let me say, before reading the report of the committee, that we have taken into account the peculiar circumstances of this Congress. We have found it impossible to cover the whole field of peace propaganda; there are many subjects on which members of the committee as individuals would like to have resolutions passed. But this Congress was called by those who originated it specifically for the purpose of bringing American public sentiment to bear at the coming Hague Conference, through our delegates to that Conference, in order that we may get as much as possible done along practical lines this summer. The committee has felt, therefore, that it was wise not to attempt, on this occasion, to pass resolutions upon many important questions of peace propaganda, but to confine ourselves chiefly to the great subjects which are to come before the Hague Conference, on which we expect to get, or ought to get, favorable action. This body of resolutions has been prepared with that object in view, and I hope those who have put in resolutions will not feel disappointed if their propositions do not appear in our report.

We have attempted to incorporate into the introduction, into the *Whereases*, what has been done in the eight years since the meeting of the first Hague Conference, or, in other words, the present status of our movement; and then to connect with this the things that ought to be done which we expect will be done in part. This explanation I thought it was well to make before reading the resolutions.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, The nations, through the application of scientific invention and discovery to intercommunication and travel, have become members of one body, closely united and inter-dependent, with common commercial, industrial, intellectual, and moral interests, and war in any part of the world immediately affects both materially and morally other parts, and undisturbed peace has become the necessary condition of the prosperity, well-being, and orderly progress of human society; and

Whereas, The Hague Conference of 1899 made a great and unexpected advance toward the establishment of peace, by the creation of a permanent court of arbitration for the judicial settlement of international disputes; and

Whereas, The said court of arbitration having adjusted four controversies, in which nearly all the prominent powers were participants, has become a fixed and well-recognized means of settling international disputes, though its operation is only voluntary; and

Whereas, The principle of international commissions of inquiry, provided for in the Hague Convention, has proved itself one of great practical efficiency, as illustrated in the Anglo-Russian North Sea crisis; and

Whereas, More than forty treaties of obligatory arbitration between nations, two and two, have been concluded, stipulating reference to the Hague Court for five years of all disputes of a judicial order and those arising in the interpretation of treaties; and

Whereas, Public opinion in favor of the pacific settlement of controversies has made extraordinary advance since the first Hague Conference, and, as recently declared by the British Prime Minister, "has attained a practical potency and a moral authority undreamt of in 1899"; and

Whereas, The States of the Western Hemisphere, through the action of the Third Pan-American Congress and the reorganization of the International Bureau of American Republics, have reached what is virtually a permanent union destined henceforth to wield a mighty influence in behalf of permanent peace; and

Whereas, The First Hague Conference, though it failed to solve the question of reduction of armaments, for which it was primarily called, unanimously recommended to the powers the serious study of the problem with the view of relieving the people of the vast burdens imposed upon them by rivalry of armaments;

Resolved, By the National Arbitration and Peace Congress held in New York City, April 14 to 17, 1907, composed of delegates from thirty-five States, that the Government of the United States be requested, through its representatives to the Second Hague Conference, to urge upon that body the formation of a more permanent and more comprehensive International Union for the regular purpose of insuring the efficient co-operation of the

nations in the development and application of international law and the maintenance of the peace of the world ;

Resolved, That, to this end, it is the judgment of this Congress that the governments should provide that the Hague Conference shall hereafter be a permanent institution, with representatives from all the nations, meeting periodically for the regular and systematic consideration of the international problems constantly arising in the intercourse of the nations, and that we invite our government to instruct its delegates to the coming Conference to secure, if possible, action in this direction ;

Resolved, That as a logical sequence of the First Hague Conference, the Hague Court should be open to all the nations of the world ;

Resolved, That a general treaty of arbitration for ratification by all the nations should be drafted by the coming Conference, providing for the reference to the Hague Court of international disputes which may hereafter arise, which cannot be adjusted by diplomacy ;

Resolved, That the Congress records its endorsement of the resolution adopted by the Interparliamentary Union at its Conference last July, that in case of disputes arising between nations which it may not be possible to embrace within the terms of an arbitration convention, the disputing parties before resorting to force shall always invoke the services of an International Commission of Inquiry, or the mediation of one or more friendly powers ;

Resolved, That our government be requested to urge upon the coming Hague Conference the adoption of the proposition, long advocated by our country, to extend to private property at sea the same immunity from capture in war as now shelters private property on land ;

Resolved, That the time has arrived for decided action toward the limitation of the burdens of armaments, which have enormously increased since 1899, and the government of the United States is respectfully requested and urged to instruct its delegates to the coming Hague Conference to support with the full weight of our national influence the proposition of the British Government as announced by the Prime Minister, to have, if possible, the subject of armaments considered by the Conference ;

Resolved, That the Congress highly appreciates the eminent services of President Roosevelt in bringing the Hague Court into successful operation, in exercising his good offices for restoring peace between Russia and Japan, in preventing, in co-operation with Mexico, a threatened war in Central America, and in initiating, at the request of the Interparliamentary Union, the assembling of a second International Peace Conference at The Hague. It congratulates him upon the reception of the Nobel prize as a just recognition of his efficient services for peace;

Resolved, That the distinguished services of the Hon. Elihu Root, Secretary of State, to the cause of International Peace and good-will, during his recent visits to the South American capitals and to Canada, be accorded the grateful recognition of this Congress;

Resolved, That we thank the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, for the noble stand which he has taken in favor of a settled policy of peace among the nations, and of a limitation and reduction of the military and naval burdens now weighing upon the world;

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent by a committee of this Congress, to be appointed by the President of the Congress, to President Roosevelt, to Secretary Root, and to each of the United States delegates to the forthcoming Hague Conference.

I move that these resolutions be adopted as the platform of this Congress.

MR. PEABODY: You have heard the motion of Dr. Trueblood that the report be adopted as the platform of this Congress.

A DELEGATE: I want to second it.

MR. PEABODY: The Chair recognizes Hon. Mr. Bartholdt.

MR. BARTHOLDT:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I shall occupy but a minute or two in seconding these resolutions, merely to state that the resolutions are almost identical with the plan agreed upon by the Interparliamentary Union for submission to the Second Hague Conference. Only in one respect do I see any difference, namely, in the resolutions as they have been read, it is proposed that all disputes over international differences shall be submitted to arbitration, while according to the plans of the Interparliamentary Union only certain specific classes of disputes

shall be referred to the Hague Court for obligatory arbitration, while in cases of questions affecting the vital interests in any way, or the independence of a nation, an investigation shall first be had before the sword is drawn; but it is perfectly proper, in their judgment, for the people to go further than the official representatives of the people care to go, and I welcome, therefore, the resolutions because they go, at least as far as a number of the European States have already gone, in the recognition of the principle of arbitration, and in the fact that in these treaties they refer all disputes to arbitration. There is one other demand which the Interparliamentary Union has incorporated in its platform, and that is, that the Congress of the United States, the same as all the parliaments of all countries, should make an appropriation for the purpose of Peace propaganda, not an appropriation for a certain percentage of the war expenditures, because that, in my humble judgment, would seem impracticable, but a direct, straight out, annual appropriation for the purpose of encouraging mutual visits, between the officials of the different nations, and for the purpose of promoting that fraternity and that hospitality, and that knowledge of each other, which are so essential to the cause of good-will and Peace among the nations. However, I have not pressed, as a member of the Committee on Resolutions, for the insertion of this plank, for the reason that it has nothing really to do with the diplomatic relations of the coming Hague Conference; that is a matter for the people to the several parliamentary congresses to decide. At some future time this question will surely be presented to the peace-loving people of the United States for an expression of opinion as to whether it is desirable in view of the millions that are being appropriated for war, that a few hundred thousand dollars be annually appropriated for the propaganda of Peace. (Great applause.)

There is only one suggestion I should like to make, with the permission of the Chairman, and the other members of the Committee on Resolutions, that instead of sending these resolutions by mail to the President of the United States and to the delegates of the Second Hague Conference, that the Chairman, or the President of this great Congress—Mr. Andrew Carnegie—be requested to appoint a committee for the purpose of handing these resolutions personally to the President of the United States, or personally to the Secretary of State, and personally to every

one of the delegates appointed to represent this Congress at The Hague.

MR. PEABODY:

I am sure the committee will accept Mr. Bartholdt's suggestion that these resolutions be presented by a committee of this Congress, to be named by the President of the Congress.

(The amendment was accepted by the committee.)

MR. PEABODY: The Chair will now recognize Mr. MacCracken:

CHANCELLOR MACCRACKEN:

MR. CHAIRMAN: Like my predecessor, I shall be very brief. In connection with the multitude of proposed resolutions, I was reminded of an incident as I was sailing down the St. Lawrence River upon a great steamer. The Governor-General of Canada and his household were upon the deck, and we had had a shower; there was a beautiful sky, and there came out a resplendent bridegroom with his bride following him, and in the presence of all the distinguished company he cried out to her: "Mary, Mary, come here; there are two rainbows—one for you and one for me." I, too, had a rainbow of my own that I brought in my pocket to the meeting of the committee, but when I found that the Chairman of the committee and the members who had done more work than I were all in favor of confining our resolutions chiefly to matters that might be expected to influence the proceedings of the Conference at The Hague, I did not even take my "rainbow resolution" out of my pocket. Now, you will see that there were seven members of the committee, and you will see there are seven resolutions, omitting the merely complimentary and the resolution as to sending this action to the President of the United States. I trust it may be said of this platform, as the Book of Proverbs says, "Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars."

If I were compelled to make a choice among these seven resolutions, I should prefer a single one to be adopted, even though it cost the adoption of all the rest, and that is the second resolution. The first, as you have observed, is a general preface to all the other six. The second resolution, about which I want to speak for a minute, is this:

"It is the judgment of this Congress that the government should provide that the Hague Congress should hereafter be a permanent institution," and so on. It seems to me that this is the ideal action to be taken at the approaching Conference of Nations. I feel, ladies and gentlemen, that if the nations will only take this action all the rest will, in time, take care of itself.

To-day is a time of Peace. In a time of war we cannot expect any Conference to be assembled at The Hague, if it is to be left, as it has been left until now, to the chance initiative of this or that nation. You all know that the approaching Conference was recommended to be held a year or two ago, but because of the existence of the unhappy conflict between Russia and Japan, it was requested by the Czar of Russia that the meeting should be postponed. Unfortunately, most of modern history has been a time of war, and we cannot expect that in a time of war there will be any successful initiation of a Conference at The Hague.

Then, both the first Conference at The Hague and this second Conference have been called because of peculiarly fortunate conditions, and because of exceptional men. We cannot expect always that the world will be stirred to action by the Czar of the Russias, who has been considered the greatest military despot of the world, asking us to meet, asking the governments of the world to meet, in a Conference of Peace. Yet that was the occasion of the first Conference. We cannot expect always that there will be so young, vigorous and original a magistrate of the United States as our President, Theodore Roosevelt. (Applause.) The fact that he is in an exceptional position, especially on account of the part he took in reference to the Russian-Japanese war, has very largely made this second Conference possible.

Circumstances like these cannot be expected to occur again. Therefore at this particular second meeting, it appears to me, will come the favorable hour to urge, by all the means within our power, that the Conference of The Hague strive to make itself, as our resolution says, a regular and permanent convention. (Applause.)

You will observe that we have Professor Moore upon the committee, and in order to make the resolution as emphatic as possible, though we might have stopped by saying "a permanent and comprehensive congress or union," that we even added an adjective to what was already superlative, and said "a

more comprehensive and a more permanent parliamentary union." That expresses the feelings of the seven members of the committee upon this subject.

Now, there are criticisms "out of doors" that we are seeking only after "rainbows," that we are seeking for impossible ideals,—a very shallow and ignorant criticism. Those who make such criticisms either have not read history or, having read history, do not think. Why, Mr. Chairman, the colonies were on this continent over one hundred years without their having anything like a congress of colonies, excepting once—when Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts met in a congress in order to provide how they could take care of the Dutch down in New York. This was about the year 1640, when the Dutch were still here, and I may say that the New England Colonies have been taking care of New York and its inhabitants ever since.

And then, in 1765, one hundred and forty-two years ago, there came the first real Continental Congress, when a majority of the colonies met right here in the City of New York to confer and take action with reference to one subject, namely, British taxation, especially as embodied in the Stamp Act. Observe that this first Continental Congress did not make the slightest provision for meeting again. But the first Hague Conference did make provision for meeting again, so far as it could be made by recommendation. The first Continental Congress not only made no provision for meeting again but it established no foundation. It did nothing but make a few recommendations to the thirteen colonies. Yet ten years later there came the second and great Continental Congress, and when it came together, you remember, it made itself regular and permanent, and continued until the foundation of our glorious constitution.

Now, I say that the first Conference at The Hague did far more than the first Continental Congress, because it not only looked forward to a second congress, but it also provided a permanent tribunal, which has already done such historic work, as you have heard from the chairman of our committee in these preambles. And so I am one of those who look forward to the possibility of the second Hague Conference, like our second Continental Congress, making provision for its own continuance. Let it make such recommendations to the governments as will insure its continuance by a new treaty. Thus will it take a long

step in the direction of the organization of the governments of the world and the bringing about of Universal Peace.

SAMUEL J. BARROWS:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I take great pleasure in seconding these resolutions, because, as Mr. Bartholdt has said, they represent not only his views and my views, as members of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union, but they represent substantially those of the entire group of that organization in the United States, composed of some two hundred members, each of them representing two hundred thousand constituents, so that forty million constituents are represented in the group. Not only that, but these resolutions represent substantially, with minor points of difference, the ideal, the hope, the endeavor of the Interparliamentary Union of the world, made up of two thousand members representing a majority of the great parliamentary bodies of the civilized world. One more legislative body will soon be added to that list. When the Hague Conference was first formed there was no parliamentary body in Russia, and that is one reason why it was called, for in discussing these matters Russia had only the resources of diplomacy. But by and by we are to have, if it is not already realized, the representatives of this great nation, the people of Russia, in the Parliamentary Union. Russia will then find in the existence of its own parliament a new argument for accepting one of these propositions, namely, that we shall have a permanent Hague Tribunal and a permanent periodic Congress of Nations in whose deliberations Russia also may be represented. The proposed periodical meetings of the Hague Conference will be a step toward that international gathering or congress to which we are all looking forward.

Secretary Root, in his admirable address, spoke of the need of taking the next step from diplomacy to judicial action. But there is also a third step to be taken: we must have not only judicial but legislative action. We must have, not only diplomacy, not only a court; we must have eventually and periodically a Congress of Nations in which the will of the people may be presented and followed. (Applause.) The great trouble with our diplomacy has been that it has represented the opinions of a few men. The leaders of government have sent their representatives,

and by a good deal of manœuvring and shifting and playing the game of diplomacy, they have reached certain results.

The judicial movement represented by the Hague Court is a great advance on that, because we can present questions at issue to the judgment of a great tribunal. But more than that, we are to have our laws improved, we are to have our ideas of international law codified and accepted by the nations as the result of the intellect, the moral judgment, the conscience of the world. That will come about eventually through an organization in which the people of the world shall be directly represented by those whom they choose to send. The Interparliamentary Union is a step in that direction. Mr. Chairman, I can speak, as the first speaker could not speak, of the admirable work that has been done in developing the sentiment of the Interparliamentary Union, by the Chairman of our Legislative Committee—Honorable Richard Bartholdt. (Applause.)

Let me remind you that it is due to the United States that the Second Hague Conference is really called. It was through the efforts of Mr. Bartholdt that the Interparliamentary Union came to the United States in 1904. It was at St. Louis that the resolutions were passed asking the President of the United States to call the Second Hague Conference. Those resolutions were accepted and acted on by the President of the United States. The resolutions going out from this body will have great influence at The Hague, because the suggestion of the Second Conference came from this country and through our President.

One word, Mr. Chairman, in this report I like very much, and that is the word "inter-dependent." Years ago as a young man I had the honorable duty in the State Department of this country of being the personal and official guardian of the Declaration of Independence, the paper, the parchment, on which it is written, including the original draft drawn by Thomas Jefferson, with the suggestions by Benjamin Franklin. I considered it a great responsibility and a great privilege to have that in my care as one of the officers of that department. Well, the ink of the Declaration of Independence is beginning to fade somewhat now, and they do not show it to the public. The name of John Hancock upon it,—that great big flourishing signature has faded out,—but I know that the principles of that instrument have not faded out. I find myself here at this Congress, however, on

the dawn of what seems to be a greater and a nobler conception. I thought once that there could not be anything nobler than the Declaration of Independence. I have come to another opinion. I think there can be. It is represented in the idea of the resolutions of this Congress, the declaration of the *inter-dependence*—the *co-dependence* of the world. (Applause.) We cannot live in isolation; we *must* live together. God made us of one blood, all the nations of the world to *live together*; live together in peace and happiness; and these resolutions, Mr. Chairman, are for the purpose of furthering peace.

We have been accused of being impractical; we have been accused of being dreamers; but there is nothing impractical in these resolutions; and in adopting them we may well follow the example of the Lake Mohonk Conference for International Arbitration. At those conferences, which have been held for more than ten years, we have always fired our shots in the air freely, but when we came around to adopting a platform it has always been adopted with absolute unanimity. So I hope that these resolutions will go forth to the world as the unanimous enlightened expression of the opinion, the ideal, the hope of this great Congress, believing as I do, that the world is to move forward in the path of practical idealism and to realize the great ideals that these resolutions embody. (Applause.)

MR. THOMAS NELSON PAGE: I want to ask a question: I understand Mr. Moore is going to speak, and as he is the first authority on International Arbitration and international law and everything that relates to it, I would like, if proper, to introduce a very brief resolution, asking that the President of this Congress be empowered to appoint a committee of about fifteen members to take into consideration the effecting of a permanent organization for the advancement of International Arbitration through the instrumentality of the Hague Tribunal, if that will be admissible now or later on.

I would like to offer that resolution, and if it is permissible I would prefer to do it now, because I would like to hear what Mr. Moore has to say about it, as whatever he might say would certainly, and should certainly, I think, be adopted by this body this morning.

MR. PEABODY: Is your amendment in writing?

MR. PAGE: Yes. It is a very brief one and simply looks to

the appointment of a committee of say fifteen members on permanent organization. I offer it simply because I find that after these conferences are over everything seems to die down until another one is called.

MR. PEABODY: The resolution is handed for the time being to the Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

The Chair has the pleasure of saying that before the discussion is closed we shall have the pleasure of listening to Mrs. Mead and Mrs. Spencer, as they speak on the resolutions. I also have pleasure in saying that Hon. William Jennings Bryan has consented to remain a few minutes to speak to us later in reference to one particular clause embodied in our resolutions which has great influence with the Interparliamentary Union. We will now listen to Rabbi Levy.

DR. LEVY:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It is to me a source of great pleasure that I am privileged to raise my voice, however humble, in support of the resolutions which have been presented for adoption this morning. I shall not limit myself to any particular time, but I hope I shall be able to add a fitting word to this discussion. If I were to say all that I might say upon the subject, it would take me months, perhaps years; but I will try to give you an epitome of my feelings in a few minutes.

These resolutions are to be placed before you for adoption, and I have no doubt that they will receive your hearty assent, but I would like to suggest that a copy of these resolutions as adopted should be sent to the clergy of all denominations in the United States, to the various labor organizations, to the Boards of Education throughout the entire country. The necessity, as it appears to me, is to bring home to the conscience of the leaders of the world of thought the necessity of impressing the Peace sentiment upon the minds of the young and the absolute necessity of every man who preaches a gospel of religion, becoming an exponent of it by word, thought and deed. The preacher who undertakes to deliver to his congregation the message of God must be a man, when true to the Gospel, whether it be of the Old Testament or the New, who is willing to stand upon the ground marked by these resolutions this morning.

Whether I am crazy or whether I am civilized, I do not

know, but I do know that war is murder, and to me has come the command, "Thou shalt not commit murder." This game of *Rouge et Noir*, this game of "Red and Black," the game of War, is red with human blood, black with bestial hate, and everyone who loves his race, everyone who reveres God, is pledged to the spirit of these resolutions, if not to the exact terms.

Ladies and gentlemen, the labor unions of this country must be appealed to; every man whose bread and butter depends upon Peace, is a man who will understand the potent argument of financial necessities; and the educators of the country, through the boards of education, must begin to teach our little children that to use a pistol or a gun or fire a cannon, except in self-defense, is contradictory to the spirit of the great Prophets of Israel who gave us our sacred Holy Scriptures, and contrary to the spirit of the gentle Nazarene to whom the New Testament has been dedicated. (Applause.) In other words, ladies and gentlemen, we must force home the truth that it is altogether too customary for men to serve God with their lips and deny him with their lives. Whereunto serves the purpose of speaking of the Prince of Peace when the flags of the world borne on the battleships of the world, carry the very cross which is sacred to His memory? Whereunto serves this great Gospel of a religion of Peace when, in the name of that very religion war is continued throughout the world? If we are honest, if we are sincere, if we mean what we say in our churches week after week, these resolutions will find practical enforcement by the Hague Conference and the spirit of Peace will prevail.

I am reminded of the story of a little boy who received a quarter from a friend. He reported this fact to his mother when he came home, and she asked, "Did you say thank you to the gentleman?" And the boy answered nothing. Again said the mother, "Did you say thank you to the gentleman?" and again the boy said nothing. Again said the mother, "Did you say thank you to the gentleman? If you don't answer me I will whip the life out of you." The little boy answered nothing. The mother laid him across her knee, turned him wrong side up, and applied her gentle hand to his tender flesh. Then she asked again, "Did you say thank you to the gentleman?" This time he answered: "Mother, I said thank you, but the gentleman said 'Don't mention it.'"

Men tell us that we can never succeed, they tell us that this movement must fail; I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that that argument has been addressed to every movement looking to the uplift of the human race. When Moses took his slaves out of Egypt, when he determined to build his people into a nation, they said to him, "It could not be," and yet the pyramids are breaking away and Israel still lives. When the Nazarene was placed upon the cross and from His lips came the expression, "Father forgive them, they know not what they do," they said to His followers, who were a handful, "The spirit can never prevail. This Man of Sorrows can never become an inspiration to the race." There are three hundred and forty-eight millions of people who to-day revere Jesus of Nazareth as the Master.

When, at that memorable meeting, just referred to by Chancellor McCracken, the Declaration of Independence was drawn up, many were the sneers and interruptions of those who said, "The spirit of the Declaration of Independence can never prevail." There are, thank God, ninety millions of free people to-day who have been reared under the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, and to-day we are free. Tell me of any great movement that has helped the world which, after one hundred years, has stood more solid, appealed more strongly to the conscience of humanity than this Peace Movement which has caused us to assemble to-day?

Ladies and gentlemen, let me, as a last word, say to you: "Fail! it is the word of cowards. Fail! it is the word of slaves."

MR. PEABODY:

The Chair will recognize two speakers from the floor, and then, as he believes all will wish to hear him, he will call on the Hon. William Jennings Bryan.

MRS. LOCKWOOD:

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I only wish to speak a word and not one of dissonance, I hope, from the general proposition touching the instructions to the Hague Conference. I represent the International Peace Bureau, and to some extent the Branch Bureau in Washington of the Woman's National Press Association. I simply want to give the message that I am instructed by the Press Association to give. This is the

message; first, that all nations on friendly terms with each other that shall be represented in the international court at The Hague—I must call it a court and not by any other name—shall be urged to enter into formal treaties of arbitration in order that the Peace of the future shall be assured. Second, that no single nation has any longer the right to break the Peace of the world. Mr. Chairman, I feel that that ought to be in the general resolutions, that no single nation shall ever hereafter have the right to break the Peace of the world. (Applause.) Third, that they use their instrumentality to incorporate as one of the principles of international law that in case of war the right of all neutrals on sea or land shall be respected, in their persons and property, and that no seaport town, even of belligerents, shall be bombarded while it endangers the lives of women and children (applause), as it always does; I think that would be the end of war. Fourth, that there should be a general and gradual disarmament until the armaments are reduced to a reasonable police force, like that of Switzerland and Belgium, both in the interests of Peace and with a view to relieving the laboring classes from the support of so many non-producers. Fifth, that the principles of Peace shall be taught in all institutions of learning of all nations, supported by money of the government. Sixth, that the meeting of the Hague Court shall be permanent and that this Court shall always be open for the transaction of business. It was suggested in the resolutions that it be open to all the nations of the world, but if it really is an international court, it must be open to all the nations of the world, whether they have signed the protocol or not. Isn't our national Supreme Court open to everybody in the United States? This International Court, then, must be open to all the nations of the world, whether they subscribe to it or not. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that these suggestions are not in discord with the resolutions presented by the committee, but that they are in accord, as I wish them to be in accord, for it is only by agreement with each other that we shall have any hope of success.

MR. FRANCIS GALLAGHER: I offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That we recognize, with great appreciation, the valuable services rendered in behalf of the cause by Mr. Andrew Carnegie.

THE CHAIRMAN:

If Mr. Gallagher will kindly withdraw that resolution, a resolution has been adopted covering services. We had better get the body of the resolutions constituting our Platform disposed of and then we will have plenty of time to thank everybody. Mr. Murphy follows.

JUDGE MURPHY:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I must plead guilty to being one of the delegates who called upon the chairman of the Committee on Resolutions this morning, but I did not know that the committee had already held its meeting, or I should have certainly called there before. I was very courteously received by him, and the resolutions which I had intended to offer I shall not insist upon, unless the committee deems it advisable to embody its substance in the resolutions which it has proposed.

Now, I am heartily in favor of the resolutions that have been presented by this committee, particularly that one which is in favor of making the court a permanent institution, but I believe that to make the court an effective court we must delegate to it some power which shall become inherent and which no nation can take from it. We have the right to delegate to it the power which I have in mind. I believe that it should be the duty of that court not only to arbitrate the differences that may be submitted to it, but in case one nation should declare war upon another, it should be the duty, the power of that court to investigate immediately and inquire into the merits of the claims of the contending nations and publish its findings to the world. (Applause.) I believe that any nation desirous of going to war would, in such a case, hesitate if it knew that its claims were to be judicially determined and that there was a chance of going up against the opinion of the world. (Applause.) It may be asked, what good might be accomplished by such an action, after hostilities had begun? To that I say that the nation whose cause is just, who is fighting because it is compelled to fight, should have the sympathy of the peace-loving people of the world. (Applause.) We should know, if we can, in such cases, when a nation is in the right. There are many ways in which the nation that is just, whose cause is just, might be aided by the peace-

loving people of the world without affecting the laws of neutrality. I should like to see some such clause embodied in the resolutions.

MR. PEABODY:

I have the pleasure of presenting to the delegates Hon. William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska.

MR. BRYAN:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: There are so many delegates who have not had an opportunity to express themselves upon these questions and it is so important that those who have taken the trouble to come here,—many of them traveling hundreds of miles,—it is so important that they shall have part in these proceedings, that it is hardly fair that we, who have been assigned places on the program should take the time that might otherwise be given to the public in full discussion of these questions. And then, too, I am aware of this fact, that each one looking at the question from his own standpoint may present a thought that is entirely new, and that may be very useful even to those who are prominent in the work and have given great consideration to the subject, believing as I do that "Everybody knows better than anybody," and believing that we can gain wisdom from all who earnestly desire to advance this movement, I am only going to occupy your time for a moment this morning and leave the rest of the forenoon to others, for I have ample opportunity this afternoon and twice to-night to say what I have to say to you. I have not had the opportunity to look over all of these resolutions. I came here this morning especially to see that one idea which I regard as important is included in the resolutions, and that is, that where questions not included in arbitration treaties arise, instead of being a cause of war, should be submitted for impartial investigation at the hands of an International Tribunal in order that cause for war may be removed. This resolution I want to discuss this afternoon more at length. It was adopted by unanimous vote in the Interparliamentary Union last July in London, when twenty-six great nations were represented, and I was glad this morning when I came here to find that the spirit of this resolution has been included by the committee in the resolutions that have been presented here, and I am sure that will be the

unanimous sentiment of the delegates here, that we should take this step now, for I regard it as a long step in the direction of the elimination of war among the nations.

The only other thought that I wish to present is this: I believe that the resolutions do not include a provision that money should be considered just as war vessels and ammunition are. I believe that the time has come when we should express it as the opinion of those who are assembled here that the loaning of money by a neutral nation should be regarded as being as objectionable as furnishing powder and shell (applause); for with what consistency can we say that a neutral nation shall not furnish powder or lead or munitions of war, and then say that the money-lenders of that nation may furnish the money with which to buy the things that are prohibited. There are very few people in a country who would want to loan this money, and I am not willing, for my part, that the interest of the great majority of the people shall be sacrificed that a few money-lenders in any country may be able to profit by the distress of nations. (Applause.) In time of war these loans draw a higher rate of interest and there the money-lender is able to take advantage of the necessity of nations forced to borrow, and while it may be very profitable to the money-loaners of the different nations to thus carry on war and make profit, I think the people who have no pecuniary interest to serve by such transactions and have a moral purpose to advance, can find it to their advantage to express that moral purpose in the resolutions of this body. (Applause.)

MR. DUTTON:

It is now ten minutes to twelve, and I move that at half-past twelve a vote be taken on the resolutions presented by the committee.

The motion was adopted.

MR. A. H. LOVE:

MR. CHAIRMAN, AND GOOD FRIENDS ALL: You cannot be surprised that I commend most heartily the resolutions that have been presented; that I commend the New York Peace Society for its tremendous advance over what was possible here in 1868, when we met in Dodsworth Hall with the same principles, and yet could not muster one hundred and fifty people.

I think every good thing may be made a little better. For instance, you speak of the treaties of arbitration between the countries. But sincerity and faithfulness in carrying out these treaties are essential to the preservation of Peace and the prevention of war. The original rescript calling for the first Hague Conference should be reaffirmed and adhered to. There are principles in that which must not be overlooked. Strict neutrality, as was said by the last speaker, should be preserved when nations are on the eve of war or engaged in war, so that no support may be given to either side in any form whatsoever, and that vessels and other property of neutrals shall not be subject to seizure. A portion of this has, I find, been expressed in the resolutions; but the part that Mr. Bryan has referred to I very heartily endorse. In our own city, at Cramp's shipyard, vessels were fitted out during the war and afterward turned against us, as in Turkey, when we wished to collect a debt, though the vessels had been built in Philadelphia.

Again, no effort should be made to collect alleged debts against any country by force, but all such claims should be carried to the Hague Court. Mr. Hay said to me in his own mansion at Washington a short time before his death, "Never will I uphold the collection of alleged debts by deadly force."

The Hague Court of which you have spoken should be permanent, and its decisions final.

Again, I believe that every effort should be made by the coming Hague Conference to remove the causes of war, so that the principles of justice, humanity, and the general welfare shall be more and more recognized. In that way armies will finally be reduced, and navies will be driven to the point of ceasing, if justice is at the bottom of all international negotiations.

One last thought. I have wished for a better word than limitation—limitation is good, but there is a better word after that, namely, reduction, for when we limit, if we do limit, we still give some countenance to war. Therefore let us see that an appropriate reduction both of the army and of the navy be recommended, and some plan adopted for its carrying out in good faith by each nation.

MRS. LUCIA AMES MEAD: Mr. Chairman: It is a significant fact that at Chicago, last month, at the annual meeting of the State and City Superintendents of Schools of the United

States, where twelve hundred and fifty educators were gathered together, they passed unanimously a resolution recommending that on the eighteenth of May—the anniversary of the opening of the Hague Conference—there should be given instruction to the children of the Public Schools on the significance of that day.

It is also a noteworthy fact, that in December, in Minneapolis, the American Federation of Labor passed resolutions which cover four-fifths of those which are presented to you to-day, and are endorsed by the Interparliamentary Union, and that three thousand local trade unions were requested to send to President Roosevelt their approval of these resolutions.

I wish to say, that so far as I represent the National Council of Women and the National Woman's Suffrage Association, I believe that we stand together solidly for the principles embodied in these resolutions.

The first Hague Conference discussed the most difficult question—limitation of armaments—which is, we trust, to come up at the second Hague Conference. They made a mess of it, for they began at the wrong end of the problem. They began balancing battleships with battleships, and cruisers with cruisers, and tonnage with tonnage, and got into a hopeless mathematical snarl. President Roosevelt, though he speaks in a conservative and cautious way, nevertheless seems to think that limitation of armaments may be brought about at the second Hague Conference, and suggests that it may be done by lessening the size of ships. Most of the Englishmen who have carefully considered the problem think it should be done by limitation of war budgets for the next five years, making them not to exceed that of the last five years. I thank Mr. Stead for emphasizing the fact the other day that limitation of armaments is not disarmament. All we ask is a little halt,—a truce,—until we can get our breath and think. We don't expect to accomplish everything at the next Hague Conference: four-fifths of what we here ask may possibly be endorsed there.

The chief doubt seems to be as to the possibility of getting the limitation of armaments. It largely depends upon the public sentiment of our people as to whether our government shall extend a strong and helpful hand to England, whose Premier is leading the world in this forward movement. If we, who have

not an enemy in the world, are in this great opportunity suspicious and timid or apathetic, we shall not deserve the place among the nations that we now claim.

JUDGE CHAMBERLAIN :

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am commissioned by the State Board of Trade of Massachusetts to present to this body a resolution, but before I read it, I must read another resolution passed by that board June 17, 1905, that you may fully understand it:

"Resolved, That in the judgment of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade the time has come when, by treaty, neutral zones should be established from the ports of North America to the ports of Great Britain and Ireland and the continent of Europe, within which zones vessels shall be free to pass without invasion."

I move the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the neutralization of trade routes of the ocean as proposed by the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, June 17, 1905, incorporated into the platform of the twelfth annual meeting of the Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, June, 1906, adopted at the fifteenth universal Peace Congress held in Milan, Italy, September, 1906, favorably considered at a session of the International Congress of the Chamber of Commerce in Milan in September, 1906, referred to a committee for study of the Twenty-third Conference of the International Law Association, held in Berlin, October, 1906, and unanimously adopted as a part of its memorial to the President at the present session of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, be approved by this Congress as in the interest of the Peace Movement and worthy of the consideration of the governments of the world, and the consideration of the coming Hague Conference."

Very briefly, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, we must move along several lines if we expect ultimately to reach the standpoint of Peace. We are doing magnificent work along the lines of various questions that may be a cause of war and also of reducing the cause of war.

This proposition involves the limitation of the area of a possible war. History has told us that neutrality is one of the greatest steps toward Peace. The Massachusetts State Board of Trade has considered that, and is presenting these resolutions as business men. They find it in the neutralization of Switzerland, Belgium and Luxemburg; they find it in the neutralization which was guaranteed by the Congress of the State of New York in 1840; incorporated in 1837.

It also finds expression virtually in the neutralization of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River separating Canada from the United States.

It has been invoked in the Suez Canal and is to be applied in our own Panama Canal. The State Board of Trade simply asks that this question may be submitted with your approval.

There are two more principles which it invokes; that is, the initiative intercourse which must be had between two nations, between all nations, which is the basis of diplomatic relations.

The other is, that the whole ocean is the common property of everybody; everybody has the right to use the ocean; and no nation, no two belligerent nations, have the right to bring their trouble and their strife into that great route so that trade is interfered with. We say these great routes, which are as clearly defined as the banks of a river, shall be neutralized by all the nations of the world.

MR. MAGILL: Mr. Chairman: William Randall Cremer, I am sure, will be known by a large portion of this audience, for he has done more to promote the Interparliamentary Union than any other living man. He said that when we formed a Supreme Court we went a great way toward the promotion of Universal Peace; that when our different states came under one Supreme Court, that was a very long step toward Permanent Peace. What we want is a Supreme Court of the World. We don't want a Supreme Court of the United States merely, but we want it to have the same relation exactly, the same powers, toward the nations, that the Supreme Court of the United States has in our states. The Supreme Court had been established two years and six months before it got a case. Why? People would not trust it. Each state wanted its own court and would not appeal to the Supreme Court. But after two years and six months it got its first case. Now cases go from the lower

court to the higher court of the state, and then to the Supreme Court, and they are understood to be absolutely settled by the decision of the Supreme Court.

What we want to-day is a Supreme Court of the world, and we want it to be in continuous session. We want every nation represented there and all cases considered where one party feels itself dishonored. The Court should have supreme power among all the nations, or in other words it should be a permanent Supreme Court of the nations, and that should be distinctly stated in some way in these resolutions.

MRS. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER: We have so much other business besides resolutions that I will add but a word to Mrs. Mead's talk. Mr. Chairman, so far as the moral and the intellectual initiative of woman is concerned and has the power of expression, it desires just as much Peace here and now as it can get. It is incumbent upon the statesmen, the jurists, and the students of international law to work out the next steps. We are trying to make the rising generation such men and women as will not only carry out these resolutions, but whose influence will extend far beyond the horizon of the Peace in sight to that universal fraternity in which men shall understand that he alone is successful who is working with and not against the forces that draw the ages on toward universal brotherhood.

MR. TRUEBLOOD: Mr. Bryan has proposed a slight change in the wording of one of the resolutions, which the committee is glad to accept. It will then read: "*Resolved*, that the Congress records its endorsement of the resolution adopted by the Inter-parliamentary Union last July, urging that in case of disputes, etc." The rest of the resolution will remain as it was read.

(The proposed change was approved.)

MR. S. L. HARTMAN, speaking on the resolution which recommended the exemption of private property at sea from capture in time of war, suggested that a small international fleet of cruisers might be created which would afford ample protection to commerce and save the expense of the great national fleets.

MR. J. C. CLAYTON: I rise to support the resolutions, although I am one of several who submitted to the committee resolutions that were not adopted. I prepared and submitted to the committee a ten-page draft of a constitu-

tion for the United States of the World, covering the whole thing. The committee, in their wisdom (and I now agree with them upon that point), said that the authority of this Congress was not adequate to take into consideration such a proposition. I still believe that ultimately the wisdom of the suggestions in that tentative constitution will come to be admitted, some time when the people are ripe for it; that a constitution of the United Nations of the World, combining a legislative, an executive and a judicial department, will be adopted; and I believe that when that action shall be reached,—it may be fifty or sixty years hence,—it will be 'found to have no little resemblance to the paper which I had the presumption to submit to the committee. I cordially support the resolutions as presented by the committee.

MR. TRUEBLOOD: As chairman of the Committee on Resolutions I think we ought now to vote on this body of resolutions, with the two or three verbal changes which we have made to meet the suggestions which have been offered. Then other resolutions may be taken up.

Possibly the Congress can adopt something in simple form that will meet the wishes of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade. Their proposal to neutralize the trade routes of the ocean was before the committee, but we did not formulate any resolution on the subject. The committee think they can present a subsequent resolution that will meet the wishes of Judge Chamberlain and the Board of Trade.

MR. PEABODY: The question now is upon the adoption of the resolutions as submitted by the committee, with the amendments suggested.

A DELEGATE: Read the resolutions without the whereases. (Cries of "No" and "Vote.")

MR. PEABODY: The delegates do not desire to have them read. May the Chair say that the delegates present should carry with them the thought that they are under obligations to see that these resolutions mean something to the bodies from which they are delegated, that they may aid in the creation of a public opinion which will truly represent the people of the United States. (Applause.)

(The resolutions were unanimously adopted.)

MR. TRUEBLOOD: I should like in behalf of the committee to present the following resolution, which covers the matter presented by Judge Chamberlain from the Massachusetts State Board of Trade. It does not express approval of the proposition, but only asks that it may be considered at The Hague.

Resolved, That this Congress requests the coming Hague Conference to consider the proposition of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, which has been approved by the Massachusetts Legislature, the Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, the Universal Peace Congress, and other bodies, to neutralize the trade routes of the ocean.

(The resolution was unanimously approved.)

MR. MARKS: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: While I fully appreciate the good that comes out of such a meeting as we have been having, expressing the sentiment of people, crystallizing it and strengthening it, I feel that a great deal depends upon our action after we leave the hall this afternoon. I have been representing the Committee on Commerce and Industry, and as such I feel that unless we back up what we say by what we do, we shall not accomplish much. Dollars have been called the sinews of trade, and I propose that dollars shall be made the sinews of Peace. A million dollars spent by us in the cause of Peace will certainly save ten million dollars spent in the cause of war, and a business man would consider that a good proposition.

I have a resolution to present here toward carrying out this suggestion, which, if I am right in the assumption that every dollar spent for Peace saves ten to be spent in the cause of war, will save, if put into effect, every poor man and every rich man something every day in his expenses, if he drinks tea, or if he eats or drinks other things. This is the resolution:

Resolved, That this Congress authorizes the appointment of the following named trustees, who shall have power to add to their number, to collect funds for the promotion of International Peace, and to disperse such funds in their discretion through existing or new agencies:

Andrew Carnegie,
George Foster Peabody,
James Speyer,

Seth Low,
Robert Treat Paine, of Boston,
Joshua L. Bailly, of Philadelphia,

and trustees from Chicago, Pittsburgh, the South, the Pacific Coast and such other sections as they may decide.

(The resolution was adopted.)

MR. TRUEBLOOD: Something has been said here about the creation of a National Peace Organization. May I say for the benefit of a number of persons that there is already in existence and has been for many years a National Peace Organization, the American Peace Society with its office in Boston. This society has a considerable permanent fund, which it is perfectly willing to have increased to a million dollars. Membership is open to everybody, in every state in the Union; the society has in fact members in nearly every state. This organization initiated the call for this Congress. It has a monthly organ, the *Advocate of Peace*, and possesses all the qualities that could be given to any new organization. It already has a national standing and I hope that all new comers in the movement will acquaint themselves with its history and its work.

MR. PEABODY: The chair has the pleasure of presenting Mrs. Robert Abbe, who will offer one of the most important matters that we have to consider, the matter of a children's league.

MRS. ABBE: I think all the people who attended the Young People's Meeting yesterday afternoon will bear me out in the statement that there was more enthusiasm there than we have seen at any other meeting. We know that this work will eventually fall into the hands of the children of to-day. I therefore move that this body approve the resolution proposed at the Young People's Meeting of this Congress yesterday afternoon by Professor Charles Sprague Smith for the establishment of a Children's League, for the promotion of International Peace, and that the following committee be appointed, with power to add to its number, to carry this resolution into effect:

Charles Sprague Smith, Chairman,

Nathan C. Schaeffer, Superintendent of Public Instruction in Pennsylvania.

Robert Erskine Ely.

Edwin D. Mead of Boston.

George H. Martin, Secretary of the State Board of Education of Massachusetts.

Dr. William H. Maxwell, Superintendent of Schools, New York.

Miss Clara B. Spence.

Miss Mary J. Pierson.

Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer.

Miss Grace H. Dodge.

Mrs. Robert Abbe.

(The motion was adopted.)

MRS. MEAD: This is the first National Congress we have held. In organizing the first National Congress we were sure that it would be the beginning of a series and we did not reckon without our host. Some invitations have already come in; one from Chicago, with a definite assurance that \$25,000 would be raised there to meet the expenses of this Congress if we will come to Chicago next time; we have an invitation from the Pacific Coast, of which you will hear more later.

I am Chairman of the Committee that met yesterday to consider this matter, with representatives from Cincinnati, Chicago, Madison, Wis., New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and we unanimously came to this recommendation, and I submit this as a resolution to you. I must say at the beginning that the executive committee of this Congress consisted of fifteen members, men and women, of whom eight were placed in New York, in order to give definiteness to the work here, and seven members of the committee representing other cities. I move that the committee be authorized at their discretion to fix the date and place of the next National Peace Congress, and then to call a conference, as was done with reference to the organization of this Congress, to call representatives from all the peace organizations of the country, and to appoint an executive committee to arrange for the details of the second Congress. I offer this as a resolution.

MR. PEABODY: You have heard the resolution of Mrs. Mead, which has been seconded. All in favor of the adoption of this resolution signify it by saying "Aye." Contrary minded, "No." It is carried. The Chair will recognize Thomas Nelson Page of Virginia.

MR. PAGE: The resolution which I now wish to offer has been submitted to a number of gentlemen here who represent various

organizations, and I understand it has been made acceptable to them all. I have changed the number from fifteen to ten.

"Resolved, That a Committee, not to exceed ten, be appointed by the President of this Congress, to confer with the permanent Executive Committee, with the Committee of which Mr. John W. Foster is Chairman, for the purpose of considering measures for the advancement of International Arbitration especially through the instrumentality of the International Court at The Hague."

I do not feel it necessary to speak on the resolution at all, and I will just submit it.

MR. MOORE: I second the resolution. This is a resolution of a practical kind. We adopt general resolutions here, setting forth what we consider should be accomplished. Then it is necessary that somebody should take up the particular things and give them practical form, and devise or suggest measures by which they may be carried out. That is the object of this resolution.

(The resolution was approved.)

DR. RICHARDS: I would like to have a congress where those questions of Mr. Trueblood's might be discussed and where everyone might bring out points; amongst the hundreds, there might be one or two good points that we could make use of. I think that at a National Congress there ought not to be given only two hours and a half to people who have devoted their lives to the work of Peace and know all the ins and outs of it. There should be a congress for two or three days to talk about other questions. What we have heard here to-day and what we have heard all these other days is, after all, only a very small part of what we have to do and ought to do. I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That Mr. Trueblood, Mrs. Spencer, and Mr. Love be appointed a committee, with power to appoint others to co-operate with them, to consider the forming of a permanent national federation of organizations interested in the cause of Peace and Arbitration."

Let me say one other word. I have a message to you from Germany, and in spite of everything that has been said I can assure you that if you go to Germany, you will come in contact

with a peaceable people. I can assure you that you will see that the German people do not spend all their money on soldiers, but you will see that every day in Germany they are paying out a million and a half of marks to the widows and orphans of workmen and to sick workmen who cannot work, and even to those who are convalescing but are not able to go to work right away. Why don't you take up those things and not talk about soldiers all the time? I shall not talk about it here—I have no time. I hope there will be a day when I shall have opportunity to say to you a few words about militarism in Germany, and I hope you know that I am with you heart and soul for Peace forever. As Prof. Münsterberg says, if you want to talk to Germans and if you want them to listen to you, you must know these things. You cannot argue with people, if you don't know what you are up against. Now the people of Germany fifty years ago were so poor that, for instance, Prof. Bunsen (you all know the Bunsen burner; you know perhaps that if it was not for the Bunsen burner there would not be so many millions in the iron works to-day), who was one of the greatest men that ever lived, was so poor that he had to smoke potato leaves instead of tobacco. That was only fifty years ago, and to-day Germany, with all its military burden, is a wealthy country, and German professors can travel all over the world and come to America and tell you a few things. Now, you cannot make people who do not go deep into things, as we do, believe that militarism is a great burden. There are good arguments against militarism, which I should like to give if there were time.

There is coming a great Peace Congress at Munich this fall, and I have been asked by the official who has charge of the arrangements to give you the sympathy of the friends of Peace in Germany. After what has happened in this country, you must help these friends of Peace. Things have been said here which will make it very much harder work for them. You Americans should go down to the President and ask for a warship to carry you over to the Peace Congress, that you may show the German people that you want to live in Peace with all nations, as you really do.

And now I want to call your attention to the motion I have made. We ought to take some steps to form a permanent organization of peace societies and peace workers, such people as

are not exactly in the peace societies but are with us heart and soul and are interested in other great societies which are willing to join in this movement.

MR. PEABODY: You have heard the resolution——

MR. TRUEBLOOD: I see no objection to the resolution, if you will add to it the words, "if it is deemed desirable, in their judgment."

MR. PEABODY: I will put the motion with that understanding. (The resolution was adopted.)

MR. PEABODY: Mr. Pugsley, representing the Harvard students, desires to speak in reference to intercollegiate work.

MR. PUGSLEY: I am not a graduate of Harvard, but I am a member of the National Intercollegiate Peace Committee, composed of under-graduates from the colleges and universities of the country, which was formed at Columbia University yesterday. I desire to make a motion that a committee be appointed from this Congress to co-operate with the general students' committee with a view to establishing peace societies in the various colleges and universities in the land and interesting college men in the Peace Movement.

DR. RICHARDS: This resolution has been in substance already placed before the Committee on Resolutions by the committee on peace propaganda of the colleges and universities of New York City, so you will not be astonished if I speak in support of the motion. I am myself secretary of that committee and we have in preparation a circular to go to all the colleges and universities in the country, as we have circularized all the twenty-five institutions in Greater New York that give degrees, to form this local committee, and if the Congress will give us the support of a resolution, we will be very thankful and our work will be more effective.

MR. PEABODY: The Chair suggests that the appointment of this committee be referred to the Executive Committee of which Prof. Dutton is Chairman.

MR. PUGSLEY: The resolution reduced to writing reads as follows: "*Resolved*, that a committee be appointed from this Congress by the Executive Committee to co-operate with the General Students' Committee with a view of establishing peace societies in the colleges and universities of the country and interesting college men in the peace movement."

REV. ANNA SHAW: May I make an amendment that in place of the words "college men" be substituted the words "college students."

MR. PEABODY: The amendment is accepted.

PROF. DUTTON: I offer the amendment to add "and professors."

DR. TRUEBLOOD: There is an Intercollegiate Peace Association already established; it was established two years ago this spring at Goshen College, Indiana. Last year it held a conference at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana. This year it is to hold, on the 17th and 18th of May, its third conference at the University of Cincinnati. The Intercollegiate Peace Conference is especially intended for professors in those institutions, and it now embraces more than thirty of the Middle West colleges. This movement among the students for a students' organization is intended to complete the work in the colleges and get the whole college body interested in the movement. So I do not quite see the necessity of putting in the words, "and professors." We have a well-organized association for them now, and the students will probably work better without them.

(Prof. Dutton withdrew his amendment, and the resolution as amended by Rev. Anna Shaw was adopted.

(The meeting then adjourned.)

From Bieneograph, Copyright 1967, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

PRESENTATION OF THE PEACE FLAG TO MR. CARNEGIE

NINTH SESSION
 THE LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL
 ASPECTS OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT
 CARNEGIE HALL

Wednesday Afternoon, April 17th, at 3

HON. SETH LOW Presiding

MR. LOW:

If this meeting will be kind enough to come to order I will ask its attention to a very interesting incident that has just been placed upon the program.

There is to be the presentation of a resolution adopted by the Daughters of the American Revolution in favor of arbitration, and the presentation of a Peace Flag voted by the Daughters of the American Revolution to Mr. Carnegie in appreciation of his services in the cause of Peace. Mr. Carnegie is here to receive the resolution, and Mrs. Helen Beach Tillotson and Captain Richmond Hobson will present the flag. (Applause.)

MR. HOBSON:

MR. PRESIDENT, AND DELEGATES OF THE NATIONAL ARBITRATION AND PEACE CONGRESS: We are come as a committee from the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, now in congress assembled in the city of Washington, D. C., to bring this resolution:

"The women of the land are jealous of the nation's patriotism; they claim for their country the leadership in every great and noble cause, and they will teach the nation's children to be as valiant and as effective in the cause of Peace as their forefathers were in the cause of liberty (applause), to the end that our flag and our nation may stand forever before the world, not only as the guardians of liberty, but as the sponsors of Peace."

Mr. Carnegie—In the name of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, now in congress assem-

bled in the city of Washington, we present to you the beautiful flag of peace now floating over this great congress, in token of their affectionate appreciation of the great and beautiful work and labor of love that you have done and are doing in the holy cause of Universal Peace.

MR. CARNEGIE:

CAPTAIN HOBSON, MRS. TILLOTSON, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: This is a time of surprises for me. I said in Pittsburg I was in a dream. Yesterday afternoon I went to the Engineering Building and opened that; to-day, an hour ago, I was informed of this last and sweetest honor, which was to be conferred upon me. Truly, I bear my blushing honors thick upon me these days. (Applause.) Unfortunately, they are far beyond any merit of mine, so that I can only attribute them to the love and enthusiasm of people who recognize even the smallest service in causes which are so precious and so dear to them. I look at that flag, Mr. Hobson and Mrs. Tillotson, and I see forty-four stars there united in one country, over the whole of which there floats the Holy Spirit of Peace. I look to Europe and I see forty-five countries, but what do I find there? Hatred, suspicion, animosity! Why? Because we are under the Holy Spirit of Peace, and they under the Savage God of War. We furnish examples to Europe now. We furnish one on the North, for Canada has two little yachts on the inland seas, and they never fire a shot except in congratulation to the two little yachts belonging to the United States, which breathe Peace and Goodwill from the mouth of their cannon.

The second example we show Europe is this: On the South of us we have Mexico, and our President, the greatest peacemaker living—remember no man holds Theodore Roosevelt higher than I do as a Maker of Peace—induced Mexico to unite with him and jointly they intimated to the South American Republics that they must keep the Peace, and they did so. We saved one war. These republics negotiated with three others, and failed, but mark my words, we have an international police as far as America is concerned. If two men fight each other in the street anywhere that the American flag floats they are arrested by superior force, a protective force. So it will be with the South American Republics before long. Mexico and the United States

and other republics will say to the warring element: "We are independent, we belong to the same continent, and no nation can be allowed to disturb the general peace in which all nations here are mutually interested." That is what we are coming to.

Now, my two friends, I accept that flag. I was born under a flag that denied me certain rights of citizenship, therefore I dedicated my book "Triumphant Democracy" to this Republic in these words: "To the Republic that makes me the equal of any citizen, although denied, by my native land, equal rights." I dedicated this book with an intensity of love and admiration which the native-born citizen can neither see nor understand. (Applause.) There is the flag that I went to the front for, but let me say to you, however, that the North favored arbitration.

As to the Civil War, if the Southern States had said: "Four hundred millions will buy our slave property," if they had said "eight hundred millions," if they had said "twelve hundred millions," it would have been infinitely better for both the North and the South could such a peaceful mode have been obtained.

I shall keep that flag always, and it never shall float over men killing each other, but shall remain a glorious heritage to my successors. It will tell them that I in my day and generation loved that flag and desired to extend over the world the reign of Peace obtained by law and justice.

International Arbitration

SETH LOW

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Those who have arranged the program for this Congress have done well to make the closing meeting a meeting in the interest of arbitration; for, whatever other methods may be proposed to advance the cause of honorable Peace between the nations none are likely to supplant the method of International Arbitration. It is sometimes said that nations do not always accept the results of arbitration. This is a mistake. Negotiations often fail; but whenever arbitration has been agreed upon its results have always been accepted. It is a just cause of satisfaction to the American people that no nation has submitted questions in controversy to the decision of impartial arbitration more frequently than the United States, nor questions of more profound importance. The arbitration of the Ala-

bama claims undoubtedly prevented war between the two great branches of English-speaking peoples. This is, and is likely to remain for a long period, one of the capital instances of the submission of an international grievance to the decision of impartial arbitrators; but it is only one out of more than sixty international arbitrations in which the United States has been engaged. The first of these took place under the treaty with Great Britain of 1784, and from that day to the present hour there has scarcely been a decade in which some international question in which this nation has been interested has not been adjusted by this means. The American people, therefore, are in a position to stand for International Arbitration with absolute good faith. In urging it, we are only asking others to do what we have done ourselves.

The great work accomplished by the First Hague Conference was to make a resort to arbitration, on the part of the nations, easier than formerly. This result was obtained by assembling, so to speak, all the parts necessary for the creation of an arbitration tribunal, so that such a tribunal could be called into being much more readily than before. By creating permanent machinery, also, for The Hague Court, by providing a code of procedure, and by proposing an arbitration treaty, which committed the signatory powers to adopt arbitration in all suitable cases, an immense step forward was taken. It may well be hoped that the Second Hague Conference will develop still more the elements of permanence in The Hague Court which were planted by the action of the First Conference; so that out of these two International Conferences there may come not only a permanent tribunal that may be called into action upon request, but also a permanent tribunal that shall hold sessions at stated intervals, as a court of justice does, to dispose of any cases that may be brought to its bar. Such an outcome of the Second Hague Conference would be a most important step toward organizing the relations of the nations upon a peace footing.

Following the First Hague Conference an effort was made to secure the adoption, very widely, of general arbitration treaties; and it has been a matter of wide-felt regret that all of such treaties submitted to the United States Senate were so amended by that body as to make them unacceptable to the Executive Department. It ought not to be forgotten, however, that, as

amended by the Senate, the vote of that body in favor of these treaties was unanimous. It should always be remembered that the amendments proposed by the Senate involved a question of American Constitutional Law and not a question of an unfriendly disposition toward arbitration. The Senate is understood to have maintained that, under the United States Constitution, the Senate was not at liberty to deprive itself of the duty of assenting as to each particular question of dispute at any time to be submitted to arbitration. On the other hand, the prerogative of the President is, also, to be considered. It would be unbecoming in a layman to pass judgment upon a constitutional question of this character. But it is not unbecoming to point out, at this time, when the question is receiving fresh attention, that any new attempt to secure general arbitration treaties in which the United States is expected to join, ought to take cognizance of this position of the Senate, and to harmonize it, if possible, with the views of the President. It can scarcely be denied that upon the question of American Constitutional Law involved there is room for honest difference of opinion. Doubtless the Senate would decline to submit to arbitration any cause which it thought ought not to be so submitted; but the resort to arbitration must depend for a long time, if not always, upon popular satisfaction with the outcome of such cases as are submitted. It is most unlikely that this country would long willingly agree to arbitrate questions which any considerable proportion of the Senate should criticise as not suitable for arbitration. It is, therefore, quite as important from the point of view of favorable public opinion in this country to command the support of the Senate for the questions to be submitted to arbitration, as it may evidently be important from the constitutional point of view. I earnestly urge, therefore, that no effort be spared to meet this point in any general arbitration treaty that may be proposed hereafter.

It gives me pleasure, in throwing open to discussion this general subject of arbitration, to welcome on behalf of the audience the distinguished speakers who are to take part in this meeting, and on behalf of the speakers, to welcome the audience to the discussion. Time was when, in order to carry thought instantaneously from place to place, some material substance, like wire, was essential; but now we know that the atmosphere itself may be so charged with messages of human thought that the senti-

ments of the heart may be carried from ship to ship, and even from one shore of the ocean to another. It is such a message that we want to send forth from this Congress this afternoon on the subject of International Arbitration. We want the atmosphere of the round world to be so filled with the desire of the peoples for the peaceful arbitration of international disputes that no one having responsibility among the governments of men can fail to hear this popular and universal prayer; and we want this message to be worded so earnestly—and yet so persuasively, that all who hear it will give heed.

I have now the very great pleasure of introducing as the first speaker of this afternoon the Hon. Richard Bartholdt, Member of Congress from Missouri. Mr. Bartholdt was an organizer and is President of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union. He is the author of the resolution approved by this Union at St. Louis, upon which the Second Hague Conference was called; and is also author of the plan approved by the recent local conference of the Interparliamentary Union, which furnishes the basis of the recommendations of that Conference to the Second Hague Conference.

The Interparliamentary Plan

RICHARD BARTHOLDT

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: If I could give a speech, I would make it to express my gratitude to you and your distinguished Chairman for this complimentary introduction, and also express my gratification at the contrast between this great Congress and its inspiring scenes, and that little modest home in St. Louis, where was written the resolution in response to which President Roosevelt has called the Second Hague Conference. This contrast makes me realize in full, as never realized before, that the pen is mightier than the sword.

Victor Hugo once said: "Peace is the virtue, war the crime of civilization." This great Congress of Americans, held on the eve of the Second Hague Conference, is to demonstrate to our own government as well as to the governments of the world that American public sentiment to-day is more pronounced than ever before, in favor of the virtue of civilization, Peace.

Peace to-day is but an armistice. The arbitrary will of one

ruler can disturb it at any moment and upon the least provocation. The people have come to realize that such arbitrary power should be circumscribed by binding international obligations. This would involve a surrender of sovereignty, true, but the sacrifice is asked to be made for the welfare of the people, for the cause of humanity and justice. It is a sacrifice that every individual must make to live in a civilized community of individuals; it is the same a nation should make to live in a civilized community of nations.

The world to-day is burdened with armament until armed peace has become more expensive than actual war was a generation ago. These vast armaments on land and water are being defended as a means, not to wage war, but to prevent war. It is one of the purposes of this great Congress to show that there is a safer way, a more economical way, and a way more in harmony with the culture and enlightenment of the twentieth century, to preserve the Peace of the world and secure it on a more permanent foundation. This way is as simple as the "Yea, yea," of man, and it requires only the consent and the good-will of the governments. To-day they say: "*Si vis pacem para bellum!*" If you want peace, prepare for war. This Congress says in behalf of the people: "*Si vis pacem, para pactum!*" If you want Peace, agree to keep the Peace.

The First Hague Conference was called by the Czar of Russia to consider the question of armaments. It would have ended in failure if this program had been insisted upon, because it was starting the reform at the wrong end. No government was willing to give up any part of its war machinery which it believed to be necessary to safeguard its national security, nor would any of the governments agree even to the fixing of a future limit of armaments. Each believed that the other was actuated by some ulterior motive in the consideration of this plan, and the Conference came near being wrecked on the rock of mutual distrust. Eight years have elapsed since that time, but there is no reason to assume that the attitude of the European governments has undergone a change, though the evil has enormously grown. This is a great lesson for the Second Hague Conference. It should take up the work not where the First Conference failed, but where it succeeded. In other words, instead of wasting its time with an academical discussion of the

disarmament problem, it should proceed to perfect that plan of world organization which found its happy expression in the establishment of a world supreme court, the High Court at The Hague which I regard as by far the greatest achievement of the last century.

The plain people of all countries are clamoring for participation in government. True to American patterns, they insist on "the consent of the governed" being necessary even in matters of diplomacy, because here the question of war or Peace is always involved. Rightly understood, this merely expresses the longing of the people for more enduring Peace, and this longing gave birth to the great Interparliamentary Union, an organization now composed of over two thousand members of national legislative bodies who believe in substituting law and justice for force, or arbitration for war in the settlement of international disputes. All parliaments of Europe, save one, are represented in the Union, and, thanks to our initiative, the countries of Central and South America are now joining one by one. Since 1904 the American Congress, too, through its arbitration group, is a member of that great organization, and I am happy to say that the last three Conferences of the Union, held at St. Louis in 1904, at Brussels in 1905, and at London in 1906, were attended by American Congressmen in quite respectable numbers.

I am to speak of the plan which the Interparliamentary Union wishes the next Hague Conference to consider in the interest of the world's Peace. The three last meetings of the Union, at St. Louis, Brussels, and London, were almost exclusively devoted to the preparation of that plan. It is a program of most remarkable simplicity; and why? Because the members of the Union, being represented by the people and thus responsible to their electorates, are necessarily conservative, and, hence, unwilling to go beyond what is reasonable and timely and what the thirty-odd governments, to be represented at The Hague, will be in a position to concede and agree to, right now and without any further delay.

The plan of the Union is that the nations agree to keep the Peace by the simple means of an arbitration treaty which refers all minor controversies to The Hague Court for adjudication, and provides that even in cases of more important or vital differences the contending parties shall not go to war until the cause

of the trouble shall have been investigated either by a commission of inquiry or through the mediation of one or two friendly powers. In other words, the signatory powers are to enter into a treaty by which The Hague Court is given jurisdiction in certain specified classes of disputes, while in all other cases, not so specified, an investigation shall first be had before the sword is drawn. A draft of such a treaty is now ready for submission to the Conference. All will admit that this plan would seem a long way toward permanent Peace, and no well-meaning government could justify, by any valid reason, its refusal to enter into such an agreement. It is equally just for all; it represents the preference of this enlightened age for Peace against war, for law and order and justice as against the anarchy of force. Its rejection by any government would justly bring down upon its head the characterization of being a black sheep in the family of nations.

This is the first cardinal plank in the platform of the Inter-parliamentary Union. The second, and one just as important, is that the next Hague Conference be made a permanent body with the right to meet periodically and automatically for the discussion of such international questions as the current of events may make paramount, and for one other most important purpose, namely, to codify international law and bring it up to date. The Hague Conference might well entrust this work to a consultative council in which all nations are represented, but whoever may perform it, it surely must be performed. No nation and no parliament has as yet sanctioned, through the solemn forms of legislation, what now passes under the name of international law, consequently every government is perfectly free either to observe or to disregard it, unless it feels bound by moral obligations. As a result of new means of communication and transportation the world has become smaller, if I may so put it, and the nations have been brought to closer contact with each other. Another reason why the best sentiment of the world should, without further delay, be crystallized into rules of international law is that at present the High Court at The Hague is actually without a system of laws to apply to causes which may be submitted to it for adjudication. This being the case, the several nations, if they were really sincere when they created The Hague Court, should at the coming Conference regard it as their imperative

duty to supply, in the shape of a body of laws, a foundation upon which that great tribunal is to rest.

The interparliamentary plan comprises a few additional demands. The Union pleads for a discussion of the question of the limitation of armaments, a definition of contraband of war, immunity of private property at sea in time of war, prohibition of new types of rifles, guns, and marine engines of war, and of the bombardment of undefended ports, towns, and villages; a definition of the rights and duties of neutrals, etc. Definite agreements as to these questions are highly desirable; yet, I hope the Conference will not permit its time to be monopolized by them to the exclusion of those questions which I have just discussed and which the majority of the friends of Peace regard as of infinitely greater importance. It is safe to say that neither the American people nor the people of any other country will be satisfied if their governments would allow The Hague Conference to degenerate into a mere pow-wow for the regulation of war instead of it being a Congress of Nations convened for the purpose of laying the foundation for more permanent Peace. The British government, it is said, will insist on a discussion of the advisability of limiting armaments, and expects the delegates from the United States to support its demand. But this is not an American, but a European question, and while our delegates could not well object to the discussion, yet we expect them to press for the consideration of the propositions which make for Peace rather than those which pertain to the manner of warfare. Under any kind of an arrangement the permissible total of armaments would have to be fixed according to population or the volume of international trade, and in either case the United States could go on expanding while on that basis Great Britain would be obliged to contract. This truth has already dawned upon the governments of Continental Europe, hence the report that they are raising objections even to a discussion of the question.

Thus it may fall to the lot of the United States to save the life of the Second Hague Conference as it has helped to save the first. I could not imagine my country in a more exalted rôle. With all the countries of Central and South America participating, America will be a tremendous factor at The Hague, because in all measures vouchsafing Peace these countries are willing and anxious to follow the lead of President Roosevelt and his great

Secretary of State, Elihu Root. The Second Hague Conference was originally called by President Roosevelt at the behest of the Interparliamentary Union, and in that call the resolution of the Union upon which the President's sanction was based was communicated in full to all the governments of the world. It demanded the negotiation of a general arbitration treaty between all the powers and the creation of an International Congress. The inference is that this has committed the American government to a certain extent to these two vital propositions which, besides—I mention it with justifiable pride—are of American origin and were first proposed by members of the American Congress at the first meeting which the Interparliamentary Union ever held on American soil. It required two more conferences of the Union before the parliamentarians of Europe seceded to and adopted them, with some slight modifications, as the most vital part of their program for the next Hague Conference. Under these circumstances I hold that we cannot take a backward step now and disappoint the world by failing to make the next great Council of Nations produce results proportional to the possibilities of this hour and to the rightful place of the United States in the politics of the world. On the contrary I believe I voice the sentiment of this Congress when I repeat what I said in a letter to President Roosevelt: that the prestige which he has obtained throughout the world by his successful intervention in the war between Russia and Japan, and by other acts in bringing The Hague Court into operation, points to him as the Chief Executive who should lead in espousing these great reforms for the benefit of mankind and thus achieve more glory in one day than could be gained on a dozen battlefields in a hundred years.

MR. LOW:

I have now the pleasure of presenting as the next speaker Judge William W. Morrow, formerly a Member of the House of Representatives and at present the Circuit Judge of the United States for the Ninth District; President of the California State Red Cross Society during the recent troubles following the earthquake, and a resident of San Francisco. His subject is "The Judiciary and Arbitration."

The Judiciary and Arbitration

JUDGE WILLIAM W. MORROW

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am on this program, so I am informed by the Chairman, because I am from the Pacific, and supposed to be in favor of pacific measures (laughter and applause); but I should lamentably fail in my duty if I did not improve this opportunity to testify in behalf of men who are seeking to take the same course in all cases of distress whether arising from war, earthquake or fire. We received in San Francisco from all parts of this world millions of dollars to relieve us from the distress that came from an appalling conflagration. This same sentiment, widespread as it is, is a sentiment in favor of having Peace instead of war and having homes in place of desolation.

The program announces that the discussion this afternoon will be directed to the International Arbitration from the legislative and judicial points of view. From a legislative point of view objection has been made that there is no international law or law of nations in the legal sense as a rule of civil conduct prescribed and enforced by a superior; and it is contended, in the absence of such a law, that there is no substantial foundation upon which international arbitration can be permanently and satisfactorily based; and further, that there is no international legislative body clothed with authority to prescribe a rule of civil conduct for the nations of the world.

The best answer to this objection is that there is an international law founded upon principles of universal justice, recognized by the civilized nations and administered by their courts. In Great Britain this international law has been declared by the courts to be part of the Common Law and the inherited rights of every citizen of that country. In this country we not only recognize this law as part of our inheritance with the Common Law, but it is expressly recognized in the Constitution of the United States, and Congress is authorized by that great instrument to enforce it in certain specified cases by proper legislation. Further than this, the Supreme Court of the United States has declared and expounded this law as part of that system of justice which alone can make a nation great and powerful.

But the question arises, how may this law of nations,

wrought out through long experience, be amended and enlarged to meet the varying conditions and wants of nations coming into a peaceful union to support and administer the principles of universal justice?

A strong basis upon which to build a great superstructure is well illustrated by the laws of commerce, and those laws based upon customs under which the great mining industries of this country have been developed and their enormous wealth poured into the channels of commerce for the benefit of mankind. But the time comes when the lawgiver must anticipate the wants of the people, he must bring down the tablets of law from Mt. Sinai, from the hearts of mankind, and deliver them to the nations of the world. The wisdom of the lawmaker must be brought into the service, and this is one of the propositions that we now urge upon The Hague Conference, the creation of an International Parliamentary body as proposed by Mr. Bartholdt. (Applause.) We hope the proposition may be formulated into the great scheme of International Government.

The second objection is from the judicial standpoint, and is that there is no executive power to enforce the judgments of the court.

The answer to this objection is that a wise court administering justice seldom needs a sheriff. Its decrees are obeyed without the use of force. This is peculiarly the case in International Arbitration.

Mr. Carnegie tells us, in his introduction to Hayne Davis's book entitled "Among the World's Peacemakers," that in 571 international questions settled by arbitration since the year 1794 all but one were carried into effect, and the one that failed did not fail because of the lack of a sheriff to execute the judgments of the courts but because the arbitrators misunderstood the power conferred upon them by the arbitration. The judgment of a great international court will be obeyed, because it is in the interest of universal justice, and justice is always a greater power than mere executive force.

The Supreme Court of the United States enforces its judgment in controversies between States, and they are obeyed without the aid of the President or his "Big Stick." (Laughter and applause). We hope, therefore, that The Hague Conference will establish a permanent tribunal of arbitration, where the great

principles of international justice may be discovered and administered for the benefit of mankind, and with a permanent parliamentary body authorized to enlarge and amend the law of nations, a tribunal empowered to determine certain controversies between nations, the crushing weight of war will pass away and the Prince of Peace stand on the mountain top with a face radiant with celestial light.

MR. LOW :

I have now the pleasure of introducing as the next speaker the Hon. John W. Foster, a man so highly thought of in his own country that he has been one of that distinguished body of men who have served as Secretary of State of the United States, a man so highly thought of on the other side of the world that he has been named by the Emperor of China as one of its delegates to this Second Hague Conference. (Applause.) Mr. Foster is also President of the National Arbitration Congress recently held at Washington.

The Growth of International Arbitration

HON. JOHN W. FOSTER

In indicating on the program for this afternoon's discussion the legislative and judicial aspects of the Peace Movement, I take it for granted that it was intended to include the international legislation of treaty enactment to that end. I desire to consider very briefly the existing and proposed provisions respecting International Arbitration.

As we all know, the Hague Arbitration Convention of 1899 did not provide for compulsory arbitration. Hence, it was in effect little more than a declaration of the nations that the settlement of international controversies by peaceful arbitration was desirable whenever such a settlement was found practicable. For this reason an effort was made to heal this defect by bringing about among the leading nations separate treaties to submit certain classes of controversies to arbitration. But in all those treaties there was a proviso that the questions submitted should not involve the vital interests, the independence, or the honor of the contracting parties. Such conventions now exist between Great Britain and France, and between each of those countries and a number of other European powers.

Similar conventions between the United States and each of several European and American nations were submitted two years ago to the Senate for its constitutional sanction, but because of a difference of views between the President and the Senate, those conventions did not go into operation. While this want of agreement was lamented, there was a general feeling among the friends of arbitration that the cause was not seriously affected by this failure, for the reason that they regarded those conventions as very defective and not such as were required to maintain Peace among the nations.

They were defective in two respects. First, they embraced only a limited class of cases to be arbitrated; and, second, the proviso practically nullified the stipulations, for an unwilling nation might readily allege that almost any question involved its vital interests or its honor. It was felt by the earnest and thoughtful friends of arbitration in this country that we must labor for a higher standard of self-abnegation among the nations, if arbitration was to take the place of war in the adjustment of international disputes. But it will be contended that the United States will never agree unconditionally to refer all questions affecting its honor or its vital interests to the adjudication of a foreign tribunal. Why not? Is not this just what is done between individuals in all constitutional and well-ordered nations? Can we ever hope for a peaceful method of settling international disputes if each nation reserves the right to decide whether or not the controversy involves its vital interests or its honor?

This question was carefully considered by a committee of able and experienced public men during the session of the Arbitration Conference in Washington in 1904. They had been appointed to consider the provisions of an arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain. The committee consisted of five persons who had represented our country abroad as ambassadors and ministers; one was a member of our federal court, two were judges of The Hague Arbitration Tribunal, the majority of them were lawyers of eminence, others were recognized authorities on international law, editors and university professors. This committee by unanimity reported to the Conference that the proper treaty of arbitration to be entered into between the United States and Great Britain was one which should embrace all differences which could not be adjusted by

diplomatic negotiations, without any reservation. After full consideration the report was unanimously approved by the Conference, which was composed of representative citizens from all sections of the country.

If such a convention is judicious and proper between the United States and Great Britain, why may it not be adopted between the United States and other nations? Such, in my opinion, is the standard which should be set by the American friends of International Arbitration. It is very probable it will not be reached at the next Hague Conference. Its realization may not come in our day. But it is the only sure method of preserving Peace among the nations.

I can not do better than close my remarks by quoting the language of one of the most eminent diplomatists of modern times. Lord Augustus Loftus represented Great Britain for nearly fifty years, residing during that period in all the leading capitals of Europe. He was familiar with the negotiations attending the Crimean War of 1854, the Italian campaigns of 1854-60, the Franco-German war of 1870, the Russo-Turkish war of 1877, and the various other hostile operations in Europe, and had seen the rise of the great military establishments which in those times had become the fixed policy of the Great Powers. His mature judgment, at the close of his long and eventful career, was that the only way to prevent the repetition of those cruel wars and to abate those great armaments was to "institute by common assent among the powers of the world a new system of arbitration to compose all differences and disputes between governments and nations."

If this humane and philanthropic idea could be realized the monstrous armies which are now ruining the nations of Europe would no longer be necessary, and it may be hoped that Peace and good-will would bind all nations in one bond of Christian friendship, and obliterate all feelings of animosity and ill-will.

I fear, however, that we have not yet arrived at that happy stage of practical concord, and that, on the contrary, the vast armaments so destructive to Peace will be brought into action at no distant date. The maintenance of these costly armies is worse than a state of war, and acts most prejudicially on the development of trade and industry.

"The question of general disarmament has often been mooted, but invariably failed. I feel confident that nothing will or can be done to remedy this evil till all the powers agree to institute for a war a system of arbitration for the settlement of all international disputes."

MR. LOW:

I now have the pleasure of introducing to you as the next speaker Señor Diego Mendoza, formerly President of the Republican University of Colombia, S.A., and Minister Plenipotentiary from Colombia to the United States, a noted authority on International Law, and Professor on that subject in the Republican University of Colombia, a Member of the Academy of Bogota. Señor Mendoza will speak on "The Prophecy of Bolivar Realized." I am not entirely sure that the great liberator of Northern South America may not be better known to the audience as "Bolivar" (with the accent on the last syllable).

The Prophecy of Bolivar Realized

DIEGO MENDOZA

MR. PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL ARBITRATION AND PEACE CONGRESS: I must first express my deep gratitude for the consideration shown to the history of Latin-America, and to those who made it, in the kind invitation which was extended to me to speak at this Congress to the representatives of numerous and respected organizations, and who endeavor ceaselessly, both in Europe and in America, to bring about the reign of Justice and Peace among all the different communities composing the human family. The ideal which has brought us together in this hall, bearing the name of an eminent philanthropist of the United States, is the same that inspired Bolivar's mind in 1815, and the same that the Interparliamentary Union condensed into three propositions approved at its St. Louis session. The resolution of St. Louis is as follows:

"The Conference requests the several governments of the world to send representatives to an International Conference, to be held at a time and place to be agreed upon by them for the purpose of considering:

"First, the questions for the consideration of which the

Conference at The Hague expressed a wish that a future conference be called ;

"Second, the negotiation of arbitration treaties between the nations represented at the Conference to be convened ;

"Third, the advisability of establishing an international Congress to convene periodically for the discussion of international questions."

Bolivar's exact words in 1815 were as follows :

"May it be granted that some day we be happy enough to install an august body of the representatives of republics, kingdoms, and empires, to consider and discuss the weighty questions of Peace and war with the nations of the other parts of the world. The existence of such a congress will be possible at some future epoch in our march onward."

For the purpose of enabling this illustrious Congress to appreciate the development of that noble thought in the exalted soul of the Liberator of my people I shall recount briefly the consecutive stages of his immortal career as linked to the rapid crystallization of his ideal.

The first consequential revolutionary movement against Spanish rule was organized in Venezuela under the leadership of General Francisco Miranda, who played an important part in the French Revolution. The failure of his expedition, in 1812, resulted in his capture by the Spanish authorities, and in compelling Bolivar to seek refuge on foreign shores. Having, however, received news that the Granadine patriots had conquered the Province of Carthagena, Bolivar tendered his services to them. With a small army placed under his command he invaded Venezuela, and after a comparatively short campaign, he entered Caracas as victor. Fortune turned against him later on ; he was routed at the battle of Aragua, in 1814. Bolivar then returned to New Granada, where Congress appointed him Commander-in-Chief of the Union army, but an unfortunate disagreement with the Carthagena Government made him an exile again. It was while he was a refugee in Kingston, in 1815, that he wrote to a friend in the terms above quoted.

Efficiently supported by Petion, President of Hayti, Bolivar invaded Venezuela anew, and though he was defeated, Petion did not abandon him, but furnished him with the necessary elements for a new liberating campaign. This time Bolivar met

with remarkable success; without delay he proceeded to convene the Angostura Congress which confirmed the powers vested in him by victory on the battle-fields. By means of a renowned strategic movement the Liberator invaded New Granada in 1819 with a well-disciplined army of veterans; crossed the Andes, and after sixty-five days of unprecedented marches through desert and inundated planes he scaled the snow-capped Eastern Andes ranges, and took by surprise General Barreiro, commanding the Spanish *Thirds*, whom he routed completely on the 7th of August, 1819. This battle of Boyaca gave independence to New Granada. After establishing its government, headed by General Santander, Bolivar returned to Angostura. The Congress that met in that city carried out the first part of the Liberator's dreams, for on the 17th of December, 1819, the Confederacy called Greater Colombia was constituted. It was composed of New Granada, Venezuela, and Ecuador. The Congress of Cucuta, which convened in 1821, formulated the Constitution for Greater Colombia.

Bolivar did not allow himself any rest. Very soon after the Angostura Congress he returned to New Granada, and in his capacity of President of Greater Colombia he achieved Ecuador's independence. Immediately after this he solicited permission from the Colombian Congress to liberate Peru. San Martin, Protector of Peru and Commander-in-Chief of the allied armies of Chili and Argentina, resigned his powers in favor of Bolivar for the sake of the cause of South American independence. The last battle was fought at Ayacucho on the 9th of December, 1824, under the command of Sucre, one of Bolivar's distinguished lieutenants.

Two days before this final victory, Bolivar, as President of Colombia and Dictator of Peru, addressed to all governments of South America his world-famed circular of the 7th of December, 1824. In that circular he said:

"After fifteen years of sacrifices devoted to the independence of America struggling to establish the system of guarantees that are to be, both in Peace and in war, the shield of our new conquered destiny, it is time to consider that the mutual interests and the relations binding together the American Republics—formerly Spanish colonies—must be placed on a fundamental basis so as to perpetuate the stability of their government.

"Mindful of these ideas, I invited, in 1822, as President of the Republic of Colombia, the Governments of Mexico, Peru, Chili, and Buenos Ayres to form a Confederacy, and to convoke, to meet at Panama or at any other place that a majority might select, *an Assembly of Plenipotentiaries from every State to serve us as counsel in all great conflicts, as point of contact in all common dangers, as faith-interpreter of public treaties, when difficulties arise, and, finally, as conciliator of our differences.*"

The Liberator's conception assumed a still more definite shape in the instructions that he addressed, through Field-Marshal Sucre, to the Peruvian Delegates at the Panama Congress. The Liberator desired that "the Assembly should be permanent so as to answer these important ends: 1st—To watch over the exact observance of treaties, and over the safety of the Federacy; 2nd—To mediate amicably between any of the allied States and foreign Powers, should any controversy arise; 3rd—To act as conciliator and even as arbitrator, if possible, between the allies, should they unfortunately have subject for antagonism tending to disrupt their relations."

At the Panama Congress were represented Colombia, Central America, Mexico, and Peru. I beg leave to quote from the treaty of alliance, signed by them on the 15th of July, 1826, the following articles:

"Article 11. The contracting parties desiring more and more to strengthen and make closer their fraternal bonds and relations by means of frequent and friendly conferences, have agreed and do agree to meet every two years in time of Peace and every year during the present and future common wars, in a general assembly composed of two Ministers Plenipotentiary on the part of each party, who shall be only authorized by the necessary full powers.

"Article 13. The principal objects of the general assembly of Ministers Plenipotentiary of the confederated powers are:

"First. To negotiate and conclude between the Powers it represents all such treaties, conventions, and arrangements, as may place their reciprocal relations on a mutually agreeable and satisfactory footing.

"Second. To contribute to the maintenance of a friendly and unalterable Peace between the confederate powers, serving them as a counsel in times of great conflict, as a point of contact

in common dangers, as a faithful interpreter of the public treaties and conventions concluded by them in the said assembly, when any doubt arises as to their construction, and as a conciliator in their controversies and differences.

"Third. To endeavor to secure conciliation, or mediation in all questions which may arise between the allied Powers, or between any of them and one or more Powers foreign to the Confederation whenever threatened with rupture, or engaged in war because of grievances, serious injuries, or other complaints.

"Article 16. The contracting parties solemnly obligate and bind themselves to amicably compromise between themselves all differences now existing or which may arise in the future; in case no settlement can be reached between the disagreeing powers the question shall be taken for settlement to the judgment of the assembly, whose decision shall not be obligatory, however, unless said powers shall have expressly agreed that it shall be.

"Article 17. Whatever complaints for injuries, serious damage, or other grounds there be that one of the contracting parties can bring against another or others, neither of them shall declare war nor order acts of reprisal against the Republic believed to be the offender, without first submitting its case, supported by the necessary documents and proofs, with a detailed relation of the acts complained of to conciliatory decision of the general assembly.

"Article 18. In case any one of the confederated Powers deem it advisable to declare war or commence hostilities against any Power foreign to this Confederation, it shall first solicit the good offices, interposition, and mediation of its allies, and these are bound to employ them in the most efficacious manner possible. If the interposition be unavailing the Confederation shall declare whether or not it embraces the cause of the confederate; and even though it shall not embrace it, it shall not, under any pretext or reason, ally itself with the enemy of the confederate."

It is plain, therefore, that the Panama Congress proclaimed the true principles put forward by Bolivar. The treaties were not ratified by all the contracting parties; but they are an historical antecedent that this august Congress will no doubt insert in its right place as one of the links in the golden chain

which is now being forged in the workshops of justice and of Peace founded on justice.

Previous to 1826, in every treaty negotiated by Colombia with other American countries it is stipulated that the Panama Congress "shall not affect in any manner the exercise of the national sovereignty of the contracting parties in regard to their laws and the establishment and form of their respective governments."

There is no question, as Bolivar said, of affecting in any manner the exercise of the national sovereignty of the Powers in respect to their laws and the establishment and form of their respective governments. The ends aimed at are Peace by means of justice. The coveted goal is to convince all nations, large and small, to submit their acts to the impartial investigation of judges voluntarily appointed by themselves; to define the rights, obligations, and responsibilities of each of them; to establish a Union on common principles whose mere enunciation will be sufficient to exclude all thought of an appeal to force.

Those who may doubt the efficiency of the efforts of the pacific settlement or differences between nations need only to recall the skepticism with which the First Hague Conference was received. Nevertheless, a permanent International Court exists to-day as a result of that Conference.

The Conferences of American Republics which have taken place during the past fifteen years, first at Washington, then at the City of Mexico, and last year at Rio Janeiro, and the provision adopted at the Rio Conference for future periodical meetings of the organization will undoubtedly bring about a permanent Pan-American Union.

The aspiration of Bolivar will be at last realized. But even greater results are nearing realization. Through the initiation and suggestion of the Interparliamentary Union the Latin-American nations are on the eve of assisting at a Conference of all the nations of the world. The Interparliamentary Union and the Association for International Conciliation are making plans to secure the periodic assembling of such a conference, at which *all* nations will assist.

A slight sketch of the ideas and acts of the Liberator of my people has been drawn before your eyes. The Republics of South America have generally followed Bolivar's teaching on

this subject. In not a few of the conflicts in which those nations have found themselves entangled have they appealed to arbitration for the purpose of settling disputes; and their fidelity to the convictions of the Founder have saved them from many evils. To-day, upon their assistance at the Second Hague Conference, when our countries will come definitely into the concert of the family of nations, they claim for themselves the glory of having been, through Bolivar, the initiators of an irresistible movement in favor of Universal Peace. Such is my people's message.

MR. LOW:

The Hon. James P. McCreary, United States Senator from Kentucky, would be here to speak upon "The United States Senate and the Arbitration Movement" but he is kept away by the illness of his wife, and has sent a telegram explaining his absence in these words: "I am in favor of general arbitration treaties among nations, and I shall use my best efforts in the United States Senate for this great achievement. I hope the Hague Court will be increased in power and permanence."

It was thought that Representative McCall of Massachusetts, might be here; but he, too, has been kept away. I have, however, the very great pleasure of presenting to you the Hon. George Gray, of Delaware, who, by reason of his distinguished service in the United States Senate and in the United States Court, and as arbitrator in matters of industrial controversy, is most welcome to this platform. (Applause.)

International Public Opinion

JUDGE GEORGE GRAY

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: To adopt the stereotyped phrase of a modest man, this is a very unexpected call. I was not down upon the list of those who were to address this assembly and came here to listen and not to speak. I arrived in this city this afternoon because I could not keep away; somehow I felt I ought to be here, if only to breathe the atmosphere of enthusiasm and purpose and resolution which I feel is the atmosphere of this meeting; to draw inspiration from the intelligent faces of American men and women whom I see before

me, all instinct with those feelings of humanity which cross national borders and embrace all the civilized world. (Applause.)

My friends, it seemed to me, as I sat here this afternoon and listened to the eloquent words of encouragement from the lips of those who have preceded me, how true it was, as said by Edmund Burke many years ago, that before any great epoch in the world's history, before any great event upon which the destinies of men and of nations hung, there was a preparation long continued, a stream of tendency that bore along the thought of the world until, when finally the consummation came, it seemed the most natural and inevitable thing that could happen. So it is with this great Propaganda of Peace that has been going on for the past few years in this country and all over the civilized world. There has been a long preparation for such a consummation as we now are witnessing. The peoples of the world are being drawn closer together; the estranging seas no longer separate, they unite, the people of the Old World with the New; and the solidarity of material interests has produced something like a solidarity of thought and feeling. The belief that what was hurtful or injurious to the prosperity and well-being of one country might be helpful and beneficial to another, is not so prevalent as it once was. We no longer consider the advance of alien peoples in wealth and prosperity as a menace to our own, and we begin to realize that the material waste and destruction, and moral deterioration of a war between nations, however remote, must to some extent injuriously affect the whole civilized world. The sober, common-sense of the peoples of the world, seems at last to have an opportunity to assert itself, and require that the controversies between nations shall, for the most part at least, be settled as the controversies between individuals are settled in all civilized countries.

We are here, my friends, if I understand the object of this Congress, to place as far as we can behind our representatives, who are to meet at the Second Hague Conference, the evidence of what we conceive to be the settled public opinion of this country, and to hold up their hands and to encourage their endeavors to enlarge the sphere of The Hague Tribunal, and thus make it more efficient in the good work it is expected to accomplish. We want to say to this Second Conference, that the first step, though halting, will be followed by a second one, so

sure and so certain that we all may feel we are treading a path which will lead us ultimately to International Peace, by means of International Arbitration. (Applause.)

I do not share the fear, sometimes expressed, that the martial virtues will lapse into desuetude; that courage, chivalric devotion to duty, and the willingness to sacrifice life itself, in defence of our hearths and our homes, will not be illustrated in the future as in the past, whatever may be the outcome of The Hague Conference. These qualities are all necessary to maintain the dignity and self-respect of nations, as of individuals, and must so inform the public spirit of the nations who submit their controversies to arbitration, that their conduct shall be consistent with their highest honor, and not a craven avoidance of the dangers of war. When this is true, the exception from the domain of arbitration of questions concerning the "vital interests" and "honor" of a nation, will be of less importance than it is now supposed to be, and it will be found that the honor of that nation is most deeply involved when it refuses to submit its international differences to the judicial arbitrament of the Permanent Court provided by The Hague Conference. Do what we may, there will still be room for our armies and our navies, if for nothing else than the mere duty of keeping the Peace, for we intend to have International Peace, even if we have to fight for it. (Laughter and applause.)

Now, Mr. President, after all that has been said I feel more and more that what we have to depend upon, what our great reliance is to be for the future of this great movement, is the education and development of public opinion; not only the public opinion of this great land of ours, but an International Public Opinion that will make it impossible, or at least (not to be too extravagant in our hope) to make it a little more difficult in the future than it has been in the past, for nations to go to war for the settlement of international controversies. When we accomplish that much, we will have accomplished a great deal, and will have started upon a course that will lead to greater and higher results.

The first Hague Conference crystallized the best thoughts and aspirations of men for generations in the past, and the intellectual ferment of centuries found rest and hope in its result. It was the first step out of chaos, and we have a right to expect

nothing but orderly progression for the future. The Permanent Tribunal is a challenge to the public opinion of the world,—that public opinion which controls Kings and Cabinets and the destinies of nations. As General Foster has well said, it does not make a great deal of difference now whether we have Arbitration Treaties supplemental to the Convention of The Hague Conference, or not. This International Public Opinion, of which I have spoken, properly developed and properly educated, will supply the moral coercion that will compel the nations to submit their controversies to the Permanent Tribunal, and will maintain its jurisdiction in the respect and confidence of the civilized world; a moral coercion that will, as Mr. Morrow has said, be better than the executive power of a sheriff; a moral coercion which is to-day the sanction of International Law, which is itself nothing more than International Morality; a coercion which keeps you, my friends, and keeps me as good citizens, at Peace with our neighbors, and compels us, while enjoying our rights, to be careful that we do not infringe on those of others; willing and ready to demand all that belongs to ourselves, because we are willing to concede all that belongs to another. When the principle of International Arbitration is thus maintained by the public opinion of the world, as it surely will be, I will not be much concerned as to the fate of treaties supplementary to The Hague Convention, by which nations will bind themselves to submit controversies of all kinds to that Tribunal. Whether such treaties are negotiated or not, this moral coercion will remain and be influential, and will eventually control the situation.

In this view what difference does it make whether we have, or have not, an agreement with England, that we will submit to arbitration, at The Hague Tribunal, all difficulties that may arise in the future between us? When the difficulties themselves arise, public opinion will compel their submission. It is sometimes a mistake to tie two peoples too strictly together; let them stand apart, each maintaining his own self-respect, and the guaranty for peaceful relations may, perhaps, be stronger than if tied together by the bond of international treaties. Irish wit has illustrated this thought with the story (and with this I will close) of the man and his wife who, after a pretty stiff quarrel between them, were sitting, one on each side of the fireplace. They had had it out, and had gotten tired, and sat there smoking

their pipes. A big Newfoundland dog lay between them, on the hearth, with a cat curled up by his side. Finally "Pat" said: "Bridget, look and see how the dog and cat live in harmony; why can't we live that way?" "Oh," said she, "tie them together, and see how much harmony there will be." (Laughter and applause.)

MR. LOW:

I have been asked to say that messages of sympathy and congratulation have been received from the King of Italy; the King of Norway; the President of the Swiss Republic; the Nobel Prize Committee of Norway's Parliament; from the Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Netherlands; and from many organizations abroad and at home; also, that resolutions have been adopted by the legislature of the State of New York, which will be presented, I trust, and read after dinner at the Waldorf this evening, by the Hon. Sherman Moreland, the leader of the Assembly.

I have now the pleasure of introducing, as the last speaker of this session and of this Congress, a man to whom all Americans listen with interest, and whom many Americans follow, as a natural leader; the Hon. William Jennings Bryan.

The Power that is Greater than Force

WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I enjoy with you the rare privilege of participating in this Council, the object of which is to cultivate, develop and strengthen a sentiment in favor of the substitution of arbitration and investigation for war in the settlement of international disputes. This is not an official body; we represent no government, and because we represent no government, we can be more free in the expression of our views and can go further in the direction of Peace than an official body would be able to go at this time.

When a man speaks for millions he must be more cautious than when he speaks for himself; for he may not be sure that in speaking for a million he is saying what the millions would say, but when he speaks for himself he knows that he has authority, at least from one, to express himself; and here in this pioneer

organization he can express the hopes that are entertained by increasing numbers throughout the world, that the time is not far distant when man, instead of settling his disputes as animals settle their differences, will settle disputes upon the basis of intellect and brains and reason. (Applause.)

We must not complain if when we read what is said here by people from different nations we detect some difference between the hopes they express and the conduct of the nations from which they come. It is not strange that our highest ideals should be above our own conduct; for unless the ideal is above us it is not an inspiration, it does not lead us on.

We read in the papers that in the South American Republics they have many revolutions, and yet we need not be surprised to learn, as we have learned from a distinguished representative of one of the Spanish-American states, that almost a century ago a great Venezuelan patriot gave to his people the very ideals of Peace that we are now trying to develop and formulate.

What difference does it make if the people who live in the country of Bolivar have not yet risen to his ideal? They are making progress towards that. We understand that Germany keeps a great army, because she is afraid that France may attack her; and yet we need not be surprised to learn from this distinguished representative of France, who has made his name familiar throughout the world among lovers of Peace,—we need not be surprised to learn from him that his nation wants Peace and is anxious to lead in the Peace Movement.

We have heard that Germany is a menace to the world, and yet we need not be surprised to learn that Germany has a War Lord who is, as we are told by the distinguished representatives of Germany, a friend of Peace and one of the agencies for the promotion of Peace. (Applause.)

England, we are informed, has a navy that all the other nations fear, and this great navy has been used as a reason why other nations should increase their navies; and yet we need not be surprised to hear from a distinguished Englishman that King Edward stands among the foremost of the Peace-makers of the world.

Other nations may be surprised at the fact that we have more than doubled our army in the last ten years, that we are enlarging our navy, and that we are spending more than one

hundred millions a year now on the army and navy in excess of what we spent in 1898. They may comment on that, and yet we need not be surprised to find that our President is spoken of the world around as a Peace-maker and that our nation is recognized as a leader in this effort to bring about Peace.

I admit that there are some seeming inconsistencies (laughter and applause) not only in other countries, but in our country as well; and yet, my friends, I long since learned that inconsistencies are to be expected. I am not kept out of a Christian church because Christians live lives inconsistent with the Christian religion. I expect that Christians will fall below the ideal presented by the Man of Galilee, for it is the glory of the Christian ideal that, while it is within sight of the weakest and the lowest, it is yet so high that the best and the noblest are kept with their faces turned ever upward. (Applause.) And the Christian civilization is the greatest that the world has known because it rests upon a conception of life that makes life one unending struggle for better things, with no limit to human progress. (Applause.) We must always expect that a high ideal will be beyond the hope of realization. Ask a mother who holds in her arms her baby boy what her desire is concerning him, and she will tell you that she desires that his heart shall be so pure that it can be laid upon a pillow and not leave a stain; that his ambitions shall be so holy that he could whisper them in an angel's ear; and that his life shall be so clean that his mother, his wife, his child, might read the record of his every thought and act without a blush; but ask her if she expects him to realize that hope, and she will answer no. She will tell you she will make him as good as she can, that wherever he wanders throughout the world she will follow his every footstep with a daily prayer, and that when he dies she will hope, hope, yes, hope, that the world, at least, will be the better because he has lived. (Applause.)

That is all we can do, any of us. Someone has said that we live in the ideal but that we work in the real. And so we must not be surprised if some of us will have hopes for Peace that even this Congress will not be willing to endorse.

We need not be disappointed if some of the resolutions passed by this Congress are in advance of what our nation would propose. We need not be surprised if our nation proposes

things that other nations will not agree to. Cherishing our ideals, we must do the best we can with the material we have at hand, and having gained one step, we must stand there until we can take another step. Thus has all progress been made.

Three-quarters of a century before Emancipation Thomas Jefferson, looking into the future, said that nothing was more certain than that the slaves would be free. Abraham Lincoln (applause) only five years and a little more before the Emancipation Proclamation, could say no more than that he hoped to see slavery, not immediately abolished, but in process of ultimate extinction. Thus we have had to work our way along, and this Congress is trying to do what it can; it must harmonize differences of opinion, for, my friends, you cannot expect that people will think alike, if they think at all. (Laughter.) When you find people who have no differences you will find people who have no thought. (Applause.) It is easy enough for a man to have a harmonious party when he is the only member of it; but he must expect friction if he permits anybody else to claim the same party name that he has. Progress comes not alone from the extreme; it results from a series of compromises among those who want progress but are not able to agree upon all that is proposed.

Now, there are several things in these resolutions that I might call attention to, but time does not permit; and there are some things not in the resolutions that I would be glad to see in them.

One of these things is the making of money contraband of war like powder and lead. There is nothing logical in saying that a neutral nation shall not furnish powder and shot but shall furnish the money or may furnish the money with which to buy the powder and the shot. (Applause.) I hope the time will come when we shall be able to include money as contraband of war and thus make it impossible for the citizens of a neutral nation to grow rich by encouraging wars between other nations. (Applause.)

Another thing for which I hope very much is the organization of a permanent tribunal that will hold stated sessions so that the convening of the body will not depend upon the initiative of any nation. It might be invoked, under conditions, in extraordinary session; but as our Congress and our State Legislatures

meet at stated times, I believe that this great International Tribunal should meet at stated times and be prepared to consider all questions that may be brought before it by the nations of the world. (Applause.)

Another thing that I think is in the interest of Peace is the neutralization of territory. I believe that the more we can get nations to agree between themselves that the independence of the smaller states shall be respected, the further off we will push the war area (applause); but I think the measure in which I have most faith is the measure that has been endorsed in the resolutions adopted here. Let me read it to you: "Resolved: that the Congress records its endorsement of resolutions adopted by the Interparliamentary Union at its conference last July, that in case of disputes arising between nations which it may not be possible to embrace within the terms of an arbitration convention, the disputing parties before resorting to force, shall always invoke the services of an International Commission of Inquiry or the mediation of one or more friendly powers."

I believe there is in that resolution the germ of more progress in the direction of Peace than there is in any arbitration treaty that was ever written. The trouble with our arbitration treaties is that they do not include the most important questions; and however much we may desire the coming of the time when all questions may be submitted to arbitration we should not wait for that time. I believe that if we can secure the insertion in our treaties of such an agreement as is here proposed, so that before there is war, before hostilities commence, there shall be an impartial investigation of the matters in dispute by an international commission. If we can secure this, I believe that in nine cases out of ten there will be no war. (Applause.)

There are two reasons that I may suggest in support of this resolution: In the first place, it gives time for reflection, time for thought, as well as time for investigation; and I need not tell you that man calm is an entirely different animal from man excited. When man is excited he swaggers around and tells you what he can do; when he is calm he tries to find out what he ought to do. When he is excited the brute instinct prevails; when he is calm, the conscience restrains. Investigation gives time for people to think, and it gives time for the cultivation of a public sentiment that will operate on those in whose hands are

the destinies of nations ; and as intelligence increases, as information is spread more rapidly, that time becomes more valuable and, I believe, my friends, that if we can secure investigations which will give time for the best living people to express themselves and to exert themselves, we shall almost eliminate war as a possibility. (Applause.)

More than that, investigation enables us to separate misunderstandings from differences, and we all know that between nations as between individuals the greatest difficulty comes from misunderstanding. How many wars can you recall where there was a distinct statement of the causes of difference before the war commenced? How many wars can you recall in which each side did not insist that it was a defensive warfare and that the other party was the attacking party? Have an investigation and let these investigations separate the misunderstandings from the differences and when you have eliminated the misunderstandings you can settle the differences without resort to arms.

What objection can be made? I know of but one,—well, I might suggest two. The first objection is that there might be a reason for war that the nation would not be willing to disclose; but, if there is a nation that wants to go to war for a reason that it is unwilling to disclose, the greater reason why the cause should be made known, that the contempt of the world might be turned upon such a nation. (Applause.)

The other reason is that a question may arise so important that you ought to commence shooting each other before you find out what you are shooting about. (Laughter and applause.) But I am satisfied that no intelligent man will present that objection to this plan. Human life is too sacred a thing to commence taking before you have resorted to all possible means to avoid it; and if this Congress does nothing else, I am glad that it has the courage to record itself on this proposition, that the killing of human beings shall not be commenced by any nation until the world knows what crime has been committed that requires so high a penalty. (Applause.)

One of the objects of this Congress is to cultivate a sentiment that will advance Peace, and one of the things I think we should try to cultivate is the idea that it is not necessary for a man to die on the battlefield in order to be

a patriot. (Applause.) Whatever may have been the case in times past, it is not now true that a man's patriotism must rest under suspicion until he has shouldered a gun and taken a human life, and this Congress will, in my judgment, not do its duty unless it impresses upon the world that it is as glorious for a man to live for his country as to die for it.

Then, too, I believe this Congress ought to present the thought that there is a stronger power in this world than violence and physical force. (Applause.) There is a growing conviction that love is greater than force.

In this very city I heard a sermon a few years ago in which the minister, Dr. Parkhurst, drew a contract between force and love. He said the hammer represented force, that with the hammer you could break a piece of ice in a thousand pieces, but that each piece would still be ice; but that if you would allow a ray of sunshine to fall upon that block of ice, acting silently and slowly, it would at last melt the ice and there would be ice no more. (Applause.) And so, my friends, while I am glad to have the Peace Movement supported from every source I expect most of the progress to come from the direction of love, and not from the direction of violence. If you tell me that you can promote Peace by building navies so large that the world will be scared into Peace, I tell you I prefer that the world shall be loved into Peace and that affection shall bind us together.

In Paris there is a magnificent tomb erected in honor of a great warrior. You enter the building, and if you have been thoughtless enough not to uncover your head the guard tells you that the hat cannot be worn. You walk around and examine the standards there, you see the names of the battles that he won and, leaning over the balustrade, you look down upon a great sarcophagus where at last rests the body of that past master in the art of slaughter. When I was starting for France I went to a bookstore in this city and secured a copy of what Ingersoll said at the tomb of Napoleon. I thought it was a beautiful thing and I took it with me and I thought that when I had to write a description of that tomb, I would quote these words that I read in my youth and have often recalled since; but when I visited the tomb something impressed me even more than the words of Ingersoll; for, after looking over at that sarcophagus, my eyes rested upon a crucifix above and just beyond, and I saw one of

the world's greatest warriors sleeping at the foot of the Prince of Peace, and it seemed to me that, whether intended or not, the bringing of these two into that position gave the lesson to the world that, after all, Love is greater than Force, and this raising of the crucified Christ above this war god typifies the coming of the day when man will find his glory in doing good and his ideal in the service of mankind. (Applause.)

MR. LOW :

I have to say that the resolutions which have been adopted by the Congress have been printed and that you can get a copy of them. This Congress began its work under the auspices of the Minister of the Christian religion, and owing to the suggestion of Rabbi Pereira Mendes, the session shall be brought to a close by the use of the words of the benediction of Israel: "The Lord give thee Peace." Rabbi Pereira Mendes then pronounced the benediction.

THE TRUCE FOR THE PEACE CONGRESS

The National Arbitration and Peace Congress
invites you to be present at a dinner
to be given at the
Hotel Astor
on Wednesday evening, April the seventeenth
at six thirty o'clock

President
Andrew Carnegie

Committee
Lindsay Russell, Chairman
William J. Schieffelin *E. S. A. de Lima*
Samuel T. Lutton *Robert E. Ely*

R. S. V. P.
Lindsay Russell, Chairman
Hotel Astor

THE BANQUET OF THE NATIONAL
ARBITRATION AND PEACE
CONGRESS

HOTEL ASTOR

Wednesday Evening, April Seventeenth

MR. ANDREW CARNEGIE Presiding

MR. CARNEGIE:

Please come to order. I am to report to you that the banquet at the Waldorf, with quite as many as we have here, is proceeding splendidly. (Applause.) They are having a really good time, and of course I sent them word that I hoped they were, because the time that we were having had never been excelled in New York. I wanted to have our end kept up as much as theirs. (Applause.)

Now, there is to be an exchange of speakers. Two of our most distinguished speakers go down there after speaking to you, and two of their most important speakers come here. A fair exchange is no robbery. (Laughter.)

Ladies and gentlemen, we have with us to-night the representative of His Majesty, King Edward. (Applause.) You know that past kings of Britain used to conquer their enemies on the Continent. His Majesty conquers his friends there. (Applause.) He is a great messenger of Peace wherever he travels, and I want you Republicans here to understand that there is behind the King, a man (applause), and a man of Peace. He is represented upon this side of the Atlantic by one of whom it is difficult to speak in terms of moderation. (Applause.) It was my good fortune to know him long before he came here to represent his sovereign, in the days when he represented himself; and we have, in Earl Grey, Governor General of Canada, one of the men of the earth who deserves to rank in the very foremost ranks of those who carry Peace and Good-will to their brethren wherever they may be. I have great pleasure in calling upon His Excellency to address you.

EARL GREY:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN AND MR. CARNEGIE: That sounded almost like a military note. (Laughter.) I hope Mr. Carnegie does not expect me to speak, for the few minutes during which I shall engage your attention, in sympathy with the prelude which has been played by his trumpeter. (Laughter.)

I desire, Mr. Carnegie, if I may do so, to offer you, whom I have long known as a great race imperialist (Laughter. Mr. Carnegie said "Hear! Hear!"), to offer you my hearty congratulations upon this distinguished assembly that you have convened. (Cries of "Hear! Hear!")

I have been asked by some of my friends what is the use of attending a Peace Congress? What effect will the speeches and resolutions passed by that Congress have upon the executive governments who are face to face with the duty of safeguarding their peoples against the possible invasion of predatory foes? Well, Mr. Carnegie, ladies and gentlemen, those of you who have been able to attend the meetings which have taken place during the last week and to witness the enthusiasm which they invoked will have a pretty conclusive answer to give to any such question that may be addressed to you. (Applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!")

But I also received what seemed to me to be a full and conclusive answer on my way here in the train last night. I was traveling in a car which received its light from power generated by the rapid revolution of the wheels. There appeared to be a fixed and definite relation between the train and the illumination of the car. (Laughter.) When the speed of the train was below twenty-five miles an hour, the lamp gave so faint a light that it was almost impossible to read, but as soon as the speed indicator pointed to twenty-seven miles an hour, a difference of only eight per cent, the dull carbon suddenly, and without a moment's warning, burst from the state of its depressing dullness into a dazzling and glorious illumination which made the interior of my car as light as day. Now, this seems to me to be the way which the train had of expressing its agreement with the dictum of Mr. Straus, that disarmament is an effect, and not a cause, and with the declaration of Mr. Root, that it is the desires and the impulses of mankind on which the issues

of Peace and war depend. Now, gentlemen, it is the realization of this truth, that a little more enthusiasm and a little more faith, just five per cent. or eight per cent., will make a new illumination which will suddenly bring upon us the brightness of Universal Peace, which makes this Congress and the influence that radiates from it, a matter of prime importance. We have to deal not with governments, but with peoples of the world, and if we can increase their enthusiasm for the sacred cause of Peace, by so little as the difference between twenty-five and twenty-seven, by which my car went from darkness into light, then this Congress cannot fail to mark a very great influence for good on the peoples of the world. (Great applause.) I am afraid that I have worked that out very badly, ladies and gentlemen, but let us remember that it is in the power of every single individual, no matter to what country he may belong, to add to that store of energy on which our illumination depends, and that there will come a moment when the addition of one solitary unit will be sufficient to convert our darkness into light. (Applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!")

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I once asked an American lady, whose son had made an unfortunate marriage, whether she had quarreled with her daughter-in-law. (Laughter.) And I have never forgotten her reply. "My dear young friend," she said, "have you not yet learned that it is only uneducated people who quarrel?" (Laughter.) Now, ladies and gentlemen, I understand it has been the object of this Congress to educate the peoples of the world up to the level of this American lady's understanding. (Laughter.)

Now, in fair and growing Canada, in whose delightful Dominion it is my privilege to live (applause), the people have already, through the action of their parliamentary representatives, shown that they, like the American lady to whom I have referred, have realized that it is only barbarous and uneducated people who prefer the quarrel of the sword to the peaceful methods of arbitration as a means of settling international disputes. (Applause.)

The people of Canada have recently enacted a law which has made it an offence for the forces of capital and labor to resort either to a lockout or a strike without first having a preliminary investigation into the subject of dispute. (Applause.)

And I am very glad to be able to inform you that although that act came into force only on March 22nd, and is therefore not yet a month old, already, on three separate occasions, has an industrial war, which, but for that act, would have engendered feelings of angry bitterness, would have arrested the peaceful development of the arts of industry, and would have left a train of starvation and suffering in the homes of thousands, that such an industrial war has on three separate occasions been averted. (Applause.)

And I have word to-night, through a telegram I have received, since I came into this room, that in British Columbia a formidable strike which had already been voted upon by twenty-seven hundred miners, who represented five collieries, and whose output affected industries employing five thousand additional workers, all of whom would by the strike have been put out of employment also, that these men had received instructions to go back to their work, because they had struck in ignorance of the law that had been passed which had required them to suspend any decision as to whether they should go out on strike until the subject of their dispute with their employers had received the investigation of a board of conciliation and investigation. (Applause.) Now, I say, why should not we apply to international disputes the principle of this Canadian Act which forbids men to draw the sword until after a round-table conference has taken place? (Applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!") I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Carnegie, that the nations might adopt, as an international principle, the principle which Canada, to her great advantage, has adopted as an internal regulation. (Applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!")

I am aware that it is useless to enact a law unless a penalty is enforced upon those by whom such a law is wantonly disregarded. Well, a penalty has been suggested, which is within the power of the various legislatures of the civilized world, either singly or collectively, to propose. It is within the power of every legislature that wishes to promote Peace, to enact that it shall be illegal for their subjects to furnish a war loan to any nation that begins hostilities without first coming to the round table of the Hague Tribunal in accordance with the recommendations of Article VIII of the Hague Convention. (Applause.) Why should not the legislatures pronounce a

financial boycott against the nation which draws the sword before submitting its grievance in view of all the world, to the independent and impartial searchlight of the Hague Tribunal? (Applause.) This would appear to be a first step, which is well within the reach of every legislature, and one which, once adopted, would lead, by gradual and sure results, to the realization, Mr. Carnegie, of all the hopes which you and your friends so fondly entertain. (Applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!")

I should like, with your permission, ladies and gentlemen, to tell you the author, so far as I know, of this suggestion of using the financial boycott as a means of averting war. After the death of Mr. Cecil Rhodes, a most interesting document was found among his papers. This document was written in the year 1875, when he was a lad of twenty-two. It was written when he was trekking on the boundless plateau of South Africa and sleeping under the stars; inspired by his surroundings he penned in school-boy handwriting his confession of faith, and his wishes as to the way in which he desired that the money he might leave behind him after his death should be employed. After pointing out in this remarkable confession that happiness was to be found, not in self-indulgence, but in the conscious pursuit of a noble purpose, he gave expression to his regret that the United States and the United Kingdom had ever parted political company; and the reason that he gave for his regret was this: that had they remained united it would have been in their power, by a single act—by the refusal of supplies—to have prevented the Russo-Turkish war, which was then going on. (Applause.) And he concluded in this document with a bequest, of all the money of which he might die possessed, to a friend for the formation of a society which should use its efforts for the reunion of the United States and the United Kingdom in the interest of Universal Peace. (Applause.)

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the Oxford scholarships which Mr. Rhodes, by his will, presented to everyone of your States, are a standing expression of his desire to bring the peoples of the English-speaking world into closer and more intimate relations, and of his belief that if the two great powers, the American Republic and the British Crown, were united in a defensive policy of Peace, as well as they are in religion, traditions, language and

inspiration, that important advances toward the civilization and Peace of the world would be secured. (Applause.)

Now, if I am not taking up too much time, I should like to say that a short time ago Canada was honored by a visit from Mr. Root, and it was my privilege to attend a banquet given in his honor at Ottawa, and I shall never, so long as I retain my memory, forget the emotion which brought a lump to my throat and to that of everyone else present, when Mr. Root dwelt in earnest and impressive tones upon the great fact that the two nations, animated by the feeling of mutual respect and good-will, were pursuing the same ideals of liberty and justice side by side; and that along the whole length of the three thousand miles of frontier that divided us there was not one single sentinel to give expression to any more thought of fear of hostilities than if we had been one and the same people. (Applause.)

Mr. Root also reminded us that within a few years, eight years from now, we shall be able to celebrate the centennial anniversary of a hundred years of peaceful fellowship, a hundred years during which no part of the brains of industry and enterprise have been diverted from the building up of happy and peaceful homes, to be squandered in warlike attack by one people upon the other. Now, gentlemen, this is an allusion to the years 1812 and 1814, if you will excuse me, as Mr. Carnegie tells me I may speak about anything I like, though I represented to him that it might be very difficult, after all that has been said during the week, for me to add a single sentiment or thought for your consideration. I will make mention of one other experience, with reference to the year 1812, which comes to my mind. About this time last year I was taken down the waters of the stately Potomac on a government vessel; and when our vessel fronted the historic mansion of Mount Vernon, the vessel saluted, the flag was dipped, the company of soldiers on board presented arms, the bugle sounded, and as we stood with our heads bowed and bared, I should hardly have been surprised—I do not think any of us would have been surprised—if we had seen the coffin of the first President emerging from the door. But affected, as we all were by the scene, I was even more affected when I was informed that the first vessel to dip its flag in honor of George Washington was a British vessel in 1814, when the United Kingdom and the United States were unhappily at war.

(Applause.) Now, ladies and gentlemen, this feeling of respect, this loving admiration for all that is best in American character, which was felt by the British captain when his country was at war with the United States, beats as strongly in the bosoms of Canadians and Englishmen to-day, and more strongly after the lapse of a hundred years of Peace. (Applause.) The year of 1912 I hope will be celebrated on both sides of the frontier as a centennial of Peace, of a hundred years of peaceful fellowship. 1812 is a date which is sacred to the memory of all Canadians, for the spirit of the French Canadians and the Loyalists is as sacred to the Canadians as the memory of your Pilgrim Fathers. On that occasion they saved their country from a compulsory incorporation by force of arms in the body politic of the United States; and we stand to-day, both the Canadians and the people of the United States, based upon a most noble origin. Our high traditions almost compel us to be the foremost champions of freedom and of Christian duty. We both represent nations which have been founded on the basis of self-sacrifice. That the Puritan leaven which came from across the Atlantic with the Pilgrim Fathers will never cease to animate and inspire your people is the constant prayer of all who have at heart the well-being of humanity and Peace of the world. (Applause.) It is also to be hoped that the virtues which caused nearly 5,000 souls in 1784, following loftier and higher ideals than those of mere material success, to abandon their comfortable homes in the United States and march into the northern wilderness, with no other equipment except the Tables of the Ten Commandments, which they took with them from their church, Trinity Church at the head of Wall Street,—I trust that the same virtues which animated them may ever remain the inspiring and abiding characteristics of the Canadian people. We are two peoples founded on these origins of disinterested enthusiasm, which in their traditions, furnish a perfect example to stimulate us to lead stricter lives of high and noble endeavor. We owe a duty to our fathers that begot us to give an example of disinterestedness to the world, and the call that has been made to us to co-operate in the cause which aims at the substitution of arbitration for the sword in the settlement of international disputes is a call which I am confident will not be made in vain on whichever side of the frontier we may live; and I close

these remarks with a renewed expression of hope, not only as a Rhodes Trustee, but in the name of peaceful people, that the Hague Conference will not be prorogued until it has established rules which will apply to the conduct of international disputes the same principle which during the last month has on three separate occasions secured the industrial Peace of Canada by averting industrial war. (Applause.)

And now I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the kind way in which you have listened to my remarks, and I shall have great pleasure in reading to you the telegram which I received this evening from Senator Dandurand, the Speaker of the Senate of the Dominion, in Ottawa. He telegraphed me as follows: "A Canadian group of members of Parliament, numbering one hundred and fifty, was formed this morning and have joined the Interparliamentary Union for Peace. (Applause.) They send greetings to their American cousins, who are working toward the same end." (Applause.) I wish, Mr. Carnegie, the telegram had been a little more explicit. Members of the Senate are also Members of Parliament. I should like to have known whether those one hundred and fifty Members of Parliament which by friend, Senator Dandurand, tells me about belonged entirely to the House of Commons or whether they belonged to the two Houses of the Legislature. The total number of our Senators and of our Members of the House of Commons does not exceed three hundred, from which you will see that you have a majority of the two Houses in favor of the principles for which, Mr. Carnegie, you have worked so hard. I thank you. (Great applause.)

MR. CARNEGIE:

After such an encouraging message from our neighbor on the North, I tell you that if our English-speaking race does not, through its delegates appearing at the Hague Conference, have something of vital importance to say, somebody is very much to blame. (Applause.)

Ladies and gentlemen, you have heard from our great neighbor, our great and prosperous neighbor in the North. Remember, we have a great and prosperous neighbor in the South (applause), a republic that cannot boast as long a history as our Canadian friend, but one that has made such rapid progress in

the life of one man as to challenge our admiration. We have in President Diaz one of the great leaders of men. He has made a republic that has taken a position on the face of the earth with other nations. And only the other day he joined with President Roosevelt through his ambassador here and prevented war between four South American republics—actually prevented it. This foretells the day when we, on this continent, will unite with Canada and Mexico and other republics below and will tell the smaller republics that no nation on this continent can be allowed to disturb the general peace in which all other nations on this continent are greatly interested. That is to be the solution of this question of Peace, in my humble opinion. (Applause.) Ladies and gentlemen, we have with us to-night the ambassador of that dear neighbor on the South, and I wish to present to you—and have the greatest pleasure in so doing—His Excellency Señor Don Enrique Creel, who will now address you. (Applause.)

SEÑOR DON ENRIQUE CREEL:

His Excellency General Porfirio Diaz, President of the Mexican Republic, wishes to express his feeling of high appreciation for the honor and courtesy of your invitation to him, and he regrets exceedingly that on account of his official duties, Congress now being in session, he could not be present at the meetings of the National Arbitration and Peace Congress, and at this magnificent banquet. He has honored me with his high representation and has asked me to convey to you his sympathy for the good work which you are doing in behalf of the most noble ideal which humanity can pursue.

Peace by arbitration is the great conquest that civilization has to make, and every effort, every move, every study, every investigation and every conference on these lines is a step forward to accomplish the great ideal and should be received with cheers by all of the rulers of the world, as it means the labor to perfect the scientific structure of Peace Tribunals, and as it is the seed which is being deposited in the heart of the human family and whose growth and fruit, by education, the coming generations will enjoy.

We all realize the many difficulties which are in the way, not so much to have the principle accepted in its high and broad views and proper limitations, as to territory and national honor;

but to establish the World's Tribunal of Peace, free of political or any other influence, and inspiring full and complete confidence in every country on both continents.

The proper organization of such a high tribunal is a subject which should be given the most careful consideration, as it is the basis, the real foundation on which good or bad results will have to stand. It is best to know what the main difficulties are, so as to overcome them by wisdom, thought, prudence and determination.

All of this will be accomplished, we hope, by the continual and persevering work of men of noble altruistic feelings like yourselves, by public opinion and by rulers whose policy is one of Peace and justice. It will also be supported, beyond any doubt, by the education of the people to higher and higher standards of intellectuality, justice and morality.

The initiative of one of the great rulers of the world in establishing the Hague Conference; the response of the Powers; the philanthropic gift of one of the best men of the human family for a perpetual palace for the Hague Tribunal; the work of this honorable National Arbitration and Peace Congress, and other similar institutions, the lectures of scientific men and the advances in public education, are all important factors for the success of international arbitration.

It is very gratifying to notice the great progress which has been made in the sound promotion and advancement of the principle of arbitration; how strong public opinion is becoming to support it and how bright and promising the outlook is for this holy and sacred cause of humanity.

For what has already been accomplished, allow me, Mr. Chairman, to congratulate you in the name of President Diaz, and, through you, the members of the National Arbitration and Peace Congress.

I also want to enjoy the high privilege of presenting to you (the speaker turning to Mr. Carnegie) the warm congratulations of all of the many ladies attending this brilliant banquet, and the gentlemen of the different nationalities, for your high respect and love for the principles of justice. (Applause.) Together with those congratulations, I may say that your name has been pronounced by millions and millions of people of the American continent and of the European continent with high respect and

From Stereograph, Copyright 1907, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

HIS EXCELLENCY DON ENRIQUE C. CABEL

SIR EDWARD ELGAR

HIS EXCELLENCY EARL GREY

HIS EXCELLENCY JAMES BRYCE

MR. J. M. W. VAN DER POORTEN SCHWARTZ
("Maarten Maartens")

great appreciation for your good work. (Applause.) And I cannot help thinking on this occasion of those who are absent, of those who have died on the battlefields, of the millions of souls, who, through the ages, will send you the message of love, the message of high appreciation, the message of their congratulations and of high gratitude for your good and noble work. (Applause.)

Ladies and gentlemen, His Excellency the President of the United States of America is one of the great peace-makers of the world. (Applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!") His letter to the National Arbitration and Peace Congress has opened new fields and has established new hopes at which we all should rejoice, and at this happy moment, when we all pray for Peace and Arbitration, let us drink his health, the health of President Roosevelt. (Great applause.)

MR. CARNEGIE:

To the health of the President of the United States. All stand and drink.

(The audience all rose and drank the toast amid cheers.)

MR. CARNEGIE:

It seems like an act of supererogation to introduce the next speaker to any assembly of English-speaking men in any part of the world. (Applause.) If there be one objection to him it is, that he knows too much about us. (Applause.) There is no use in trying to put on a good face. There is no use in trying to dissemble, to hide our few faults, or to expose our numerous virtues. This man knows them all better than most of us, and he is here representing His Majesty from Great Britain, as Earl Grey is representing him from Canada. I will say nothing more about him, for every intelligent man and woman knows him. (Applause.) I have great pleasure in introducing to you the Right Honorable James Bryce, Ambassador Extraordinary from his Britannic Majesty to the United States. (Great applause.)

MR. BRYCE:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: First, let me thank you for the great kindness of your reception. I cannot tell you how deeply I feel the kindness with which here, and

on many other occasions, I have been received in this country. To me it is not a foreign country. I feel that I am among friends. (Applause.) Ladies and gentlemen, let me say at once that it is a great pleasure to see so many ladies here to-night. (Applause and laughter.) I pass over the other reasons (laughter), but I say it is a great pleasure to know that women are throwing their influence, as they ought to throw it, and it is a powerful influence, upon the cause which brings us together. Now, Mr. Carnegie, ladies and gentlemen, this is the end of the fourth day, on which able speakers, distinguished men from both sides of the ocean, have been descanting on the horror and the folly of war and upon the blessings of Peace. There has been a great array of authority on the side of Peace. You have printed in the paper distributed to us to-night a list of extracts from every President of the United States, culminating in the one from your present President, who has also sent a message of sympathy to this Congress, and who is like my own Sovereign and like the Canadian Sovereign, King Edward VII, a true friend of Peace. (Applause.)

Let me add that it is with the greatest pleasure that we have received the further testimony which has been given by my friend and colleague, the Ambassador of Mexico from the distinguished President of that great state. (Applause.)

We have also had a great weight of argument in favor of Peace. Members of this Congress have shown to one another's satisfaction that war is irrational, that it is immoral, that it is unphilosophical, that it is unchristian; and they have also shown, which perhaps it is well to do in a commercial center like New York, that it is unprofitable. (Laughter.) In fact, it is bad business. The argument is complete; and I congratulate you, Mr. Carnegie, upon the success which has attended this Congress, upon the impression which it has made, not only, I think, in America, but also upon the world at large. And I think we may all congratulate you, who have done so much for so many years in this cause, that this Congress has proved so great a success. (Applause.)

But, when we are satisfied that we have proved war to be wrong, how much further have we got? What about the future? We may look back on the past and be able to say, with some confidence, that war in the past has almost always been unneces-

sary. I will venture to say that in the last sixty years there has been only one war which could have been called necessary; that is to say, only one war the object of which was worth fighting for, and which object could not have been obtained by peaceful means. I am not going to tell you what war that was. (Great laughter and applause.) Everybody might not agree with the particular war which I have in mind. (Laughter.) Therefore I will leave the name of that war blank and everybody can fill it up according to his own pleasure.

Let us think a little of the future. What are we going to do to prevent war in the future? Suppose some cynical critic should come and say to us: Ladies and gentlemen, you have had a successful Congress, because you are now agreed. You came here being friends of Peace and believers in Peace. You are, according to the French saying, "Preaching to the converted," but you ought to bring in the unconverted; you ought to preach to them; you ought to try to convince, not only one another, but those whom the Scripture calls "The people that delight in war." Are we doing that? Our cynic will continue: What result, he will say, do you expect to attain by your resolutions? Are you not rather like a congress of sheep, with irreproachable white fleeces (laughter) who are met together to pass resolutions entreating the wolves to leave off biting? (Laughter.) You must get after the wolves, you must put pressure on the wolves, you must remove the causes which in the past have made for war. Now, that ought to lead us to ask, how it is that war has come about? I think that the phenomena are fairly familiar to many of us. A difference arises between two nations. Each nation knows and sees and thinks only of its own side. It doesn't know—it doesn't often care to know—the side of the other nation. They state the case of their own nation very fully and they neglect altogether to state the case of the other nation. They exaggerate altogether the object of dispute, and they tell the nation that its honor is involved in fighting for it. They collect every spiteful, angry or malicious word that is spoken in the newspapers of the other nation and publish it to the nation in which they are, and they omit everything that can soften feeling and mitigate hostility. In that way they lash the people into a fury. The governments get frightened; the governments drift with the tides and war is declared.

We all know that in times past wars have come about in this way. And one of the saddest outcomes of it is that not only do the wolves rush in and become masters of the field, but that many of those innocent sheep, who were meeting in congresses and passing resolutions in favor of Peace, turn into wolves themselves. (Laughter and applause.)

I am afraid that at the bottom of the most of us there is a little touch of the wolfish element; and when a nation gets excited, when people lose their heads under the stimulus of passion, the wolf comes to the top. Now, whose fault is it that these things happen? Is it the fault of the governments? I don't deny that governments, which ought to know and generally do know, more about the merits of the case than the people know, are sometimes weak and fail to assert their own views with sufficient firmness, but they say that the nation wants them to go to war. Is it the fault of the newspapers? We all know that the newspapers do often fan the flame and spread the flame,—but why do they do it? Because the newspapers believe that they are pleasing the people. The newspapers want to please the people; they don't want to displease the people; they want to give the people what they think the people want to have. Ladies and gentlemen, it isn't for us to blame the newspapers. The press of every country is what the country makes it. (Applause.) Every nation has exactly the sort of newspaper it deserves. (Applause.) I am afraid that in the last resort the cause of the breaking out of war rests with the people. It is because the people forget those excellent maxims which they had supposedly believed in and adhered to in quiet times; because they are carried away by the passion, which works like a fever in the air and carries them into that course which they were previously resolved to avoid. Now, if that is so, and I am afraid the recollections of many of us can confirm it, if that is so, what can we do to prevent in the future what we have so often seen in the past? How shall we prevent nations from losing their heads? There are, I think, three expedients, three possible expedients that may be suggested.

The first is that every nation should endeavor to reduce the pride it feels in its large military and naval forces, because the possession of those large naval and military forces necessarily leads it to desire to use the armament for which it has been

taxing itself so heavily. Now, I do not deny that the question of the limitation of armament is an extremely difficult question. **Everyone** knows the obstacles there are to a simultaneous reduction of armament by the great powers. The object is one of such extreme importance that it ought to be seriously studied, kept before the minds of all the great nations, presented to them on every occasion when they gather together, so that, if possible, some attempt may be made to solve this difficult and yet immensely important problem. It doesn't get any easier by waiting. The difficulties do not diminish while you wait, and the armaments go on increasing. I do believe that it will be the duty of the Hague Conference to address itself in an earnest spirit to this question, and even if it is not possible now to bring about that system which we all desire, at any rate let the question be seriously studied and let an effort be made to advance one stage toward its solution. (Applause.)

The second measure we may take is that of endeavoring to frame general treaties of arbitration, treaties with a wider scope than arbitration treaties have generally had in the past. Treaties which will embrace every case where a disinterested third party could enable two nations to adjust their differences. It is not always possible to have a judicial decision, but much is gained in getting a dispassionate third party, such as the Court of the Hague Tribunal, to suggest some course that will enable them to find a common solution. There are many cases in which a nation is told that its honor is involved, and its own honor is dear to a nation. But if there is a Court of Arbitration which can tell the nation that its honor will not suffer by making a concession, it becomes easier for the nation to make the concession and the danger of a conflict is averted. (Applause.)

Let us earnestly hope that this sitting of the Hague Tribunal may devote itself to the question of constituting a permanent body, which cannot be too authoritative, and of investing that body with the widest powers that the arbitration treaties can give it as arbitrator or as mediator in the largest possible number of cases of difference. (Applause.)

Lastly, although it is quite true that a Congress like this cannot hope to avert the advent of those crises, which in times past have frequently ended in war, still it surely can do a great deal in endeavoring to diffuse among the masses of the people

a sense of responsibility, which we all have, which every citizen has, which is the greatest of all in countries, like your country and my country, where the power rests in the hands of the individual voter, to bring home to him his responsibility in putting an end to the oldest of all the evils that afflict humanity. The older an evil is, the more ingrained it is in human nature, the more difficult it is to root it out. We must be content if we can make some progress. I believe we have made some progress and are making more. It is something, that so long a period should have elapsed without any great European war; and I think we all may agree that whether or not the spirit of Christianity is any stronger than it has been, this at least is true, that the spirit of Christianity was never so much directed as it is to-day toward removing the actual evils which afflict the world. (Applause.) Congresses like this may surely do much to strengthen that beneficent influence, and may do much to summon the nations of the earth to listen to the voice that pleads for Peace. (Applause.)

MR. CARNEGIE:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am requested to announce that our two ambassadors, Sir Robert Cranston, Lord Provost of Edinburgh, and his companion, Ambassador Creel, are just taking their departure to enlighten the corresponding banquet at the Waldorf; we expect to receive two ambassadors back from them in the course of a few minutes.

Ladies and gentlemen, there usually exists in every country, perhaps not all at the same time, but every country has had one or more, such characters as I am to describe. Britain had hers in Mr. Gladstone, who won and justly bore the character of "The Grand Old Man." (Applause.) We have one in this Republic, known from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the borders of Canada to the borders of Mexico.

There is only one, and there never can be more than one at one time, and I have the pleasure to-night of presenting to you "The Grand Old Man" of our Republic. (Great applause.)

REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The old man has lived long enough to know how to hold his tongue upon occasions. (Ap-

plause.) So I do not propose at present to say one word about Peace. I am going to say one word about Justice. (Applause.) Give us Justice and Peace will follow. (Applause.) When you meet in a train as you are going home a lady who tells you that her great-grandfather fought at Bunker Hill, thank her for her great-grandfather and thank her that he fought there (applause), but tell her that you have not been here to talk Peace, but to talk Justice. (Applause.) In the year 1789 the first Peace Society in the world was formed. The name of it was, and still is, the United States of America. (Applause and cries of "Good!") The United States of America has the honor of showing to the world that thirteen nations can live together in Peace. The way the United States of America taught that was by establishing a Supreme Court, a common tribunal, to decide all questions which existed between the States. A task like that is before us now. They had to reconcile thirteen different colonies, sovereign and independent, of different religions, of different languages and of different origin. But the United States of America did that thing. I am speaking to people from Missouri and from Iowa who do not know that a generation ago the armies of these two States were ready to fight against each other. Why didn't they fight each other? Because the Supreme Court of the United States decided the question between them. They never sent a Sheriff there; they never sent a Marshal there, but the great nations of Missouri and Iowa are at Peace and they have been at Peace, because there was a supreme tribunal. It was two years before the Supreme Court of the United States had a question come before it between man and man, or between State and State. Once in a quarter the Supreme Court met, made a memorandum that it had met, appointed a few court officers and adjourned. Its work was in the circuit of the different States.

Now our friends say to us, what has the Hague Tribunal done? The gentlemen of the press compliment us who are here. They call us rabid. "What," they say, "have the rabid done?" Well, the supreme tribunal established there has only settled five or six questions of difference. Isn't that worth talking about? Isn't that worth comparing with a good baseball column? Isn't that worth comparing with an accident on the railroad in which three hundred people are killed? "Oh, we

can't waste any time on the Hague Tribunal. It is on the shelf; what next?" (Laughter.)

I was talking within a month with a gentleman of the highest authority in recent history, and he said to me: "The Republic doesn't care, and the Republic doesn't know; but when the trawling incident took place and when some Russian vessels fired upon some English fishermen, there was no war." Why was there no war? Because that forgotten Hague Tribunal had laid down the relations which existed between the governments. Because that forgotten tribunal had made the arrangements by which the courts of England and Russia could provide for an examination into that question. Because the Russian fleet was stopped at Gibraltar until that investigation could be continued. Because of that, this man of authority, this man who knew what he was talking about, said to me there was no war between Russia and England. Really, as we go home to-night, as we meet these people in the cars who say we are "rabid," I think we might suggest to them that it is something, that we have brought about justice in half a dozen cases where justice would not have been known. (Applause.)

Believe me, ladies and gentlemen, it is the last word I will say to you. Peace follows Justice. (Applause.) Peace follows Justice, and that is what we are here for. (Great applause.)

PROFESSOR GEORGE W. KIRCHWEY:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, after making a most important and interesting announcement at the parallel dinner going on at the Waldorf-Astoria, has presented himself here, with a message from the French Republic, which he will now, with your permission, deliver.

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: You will excuse me for arriving late, but I find a difficulty in not being accustomed yet to having two dinners the same evening (laughter), and still less to making two speeches after these two dinners. But I am very happy and very proud of having this opportunity to speak on the last

evening of the Congress. I can tell you that I shall go back to my country full of faith, full of certainty for the future. After I arrived here to-night I witnessed the sight of a most respected and great old man speaking like a young man. (Applause.) Knowing him as we all do, but also from what my friend, Mr. Carnegie has said, I think you will allow me to say, as a foreigner who came here yesterday and who will be gone to-morrow, that it was a fine sight to see in your great country an old man speaking like a young man, speaking of the future. I thought yesterday I had seen all that I could enjoy when I had seen your American children full of confidence of Peace, but I see now better still; I see there is no difference here between generations; I see that the old people are not against the young people; I see that you all agree in aiming at this admirable idea, the substitution of arbitration and justice for the horrors of war. (Great applause, during the course of which Dr. Hale bowed to Baron d'Estournelles.)

I trust you will excuse me, ladies and gentlemen, for speaking thus, but we are amongst friends and we may say what we feel. (Applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!") And chiefly when what we feel now is so good and so encouraging, and for a European, for a Frenchman, so necessary.

When I return to Europe I shall find skeptics laughing as they always do when one speaks of a new idea, but I shall not mind; I shall tell them: "You may laugh, you old people (laughter), but you do not live in America. They act their belief and you will be obliged to follow them." (Great applause.)

It is not a mere phrase, it is a fact. They will follow you. It is not the first time. They know the way now. (Laughter.) Five or six years ago, I know it well and many of my friends can tell you, five or six years ago you could not have given such a double dinner. We could not have spoken of our faith and of our certainty as we do to-night, because very few people would believe in the future of arbitration. We were all laughing at the Hague Court. We said it was an ideal, a dream, and in fact that dream had no existence. No one would present a case for the new court to judge. It was America who gave the first case to the Hague Court. That is to say, it was America which

gave existence to the Hague Court. (Applause.) But that was not enough, and that is what I want to speak about to-night. I know the matter very well, because I belonged to the first Hague Conference. I was there with my American colleagues and we have not forgotten. The poor Hague Court was existing on paper, but had no ground, no house or home. Then a man came and you may well be proud that that man was an American, too. He said, "It is really too bad to see such a great institution with such a great future without a home. Perhaps if I give it a home it will receive more consideration from the governments." So Mr. Andrew Carnegie came and upon his own initiative gave that home, that palace, the first institution for international arbitration. (Great applause.) He gave it, and it was a very important act. Yet it was very little compared to the great example, I do not say to the lesson, to the great example he gave, an example which has been striking enough to decide the governments to follow the American way. (Applause.)

And now the Court of The Hague exists, and we can be pretty sure that in a few years we will see the Hague Court established as your great Supreme Court of the United States is, and that Court, which has been for three or four years quite empty, will be so full of cases that it will almost require two courts instead of one. This is due to your initiative (the speaker turning to Mr. Carnegie), and this has been the example given to the governments of the world. The governments are not ungrateful. They understand now what has been done, and in France especially they appreciate it. They have not forgotten the principles of the French Revolution. Our great Revolution considered that it is not enough for a man to be a good citizen of his own country, he must try to be a good citizen of all the world. (Great applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!") And because we found in France that the act of Mr. Andrew Carnegie was a faithful application of our most beloved and respected principle, the government of France, the Republic, wanted to send a public testimonial of its esteem and gratitude to the man who has furnished such a good example and built the Palace of Peace. (Great applause.)

Mr. Carnegie, let me say, my dear friend (turning to Mr. Carnegie), that I am very happy to be the bearer of the good news. You are now to be in the rank of a Commander of the

Legion of Honor. Let me, my dear friend, attach to you this ribbon (the Baron here placed the order about the neck of Mr. Carnegie), let me consider now that you are an American, as well as an Englishman, an Englishman as well as a Frenchman, a citizen of the world. You have done a great work and we thank you. (At this point there was great applause, the audience rising *en masse*.)

MR. CARNEGIE:

MY FRIENDS; BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT: This honor is as surprising as it is overwhelming. None knows better than I that it is not deserved. No, it is not deserved for anything that I have done; but if a heart that keeps on enlarging as I grow older (applause and cries of "Bravo!"), embracing more and more of the world and the people of the world, if that merits the cross of the Legion of Honor, I believe that I do deserve it. For I do find with every successive year of my life that I take higher and higher views, that I think more and more of humanity, that I have brighter and brighter visions of its future. (Great applause.)

That this honor comes from France makes it doubly acceptable. (Applause.) I remember what France was to this Republic when she needed a friend. (Applause.) I remember what the French people are capable of sacrificing for an ideal. (Applause.) I know what France has done for the world of art. And I know what the Legion of Honor means. It embraces the men of distinction in every field of human endeavor. The great man of France to-day has been selected by a vote of several millions of her people recently. The soldier? No. Napoleon himself was seventh on the list. Pasteur, the hero of civilization, as Napoleon is the hero of barbarism, was first, followed by two scientists and then by two authors; and Napoleon, who was like some huge Colossus, is seventh already in the estimation of that intelligent people, the French, and with every successive vote destined to fall lower and lower in the list until his name be remembered no more except as a monster who killed his fellowman for his own glory. I love France for her idealism; I love her because she was the friend of this, my country; I love her because she was a friend of my native land,

for Scotland and France were ever good friends. (Applause.) None knows so well as I that I do not deserve this honor, but it is so great an honor it doesn't exalt; it humbles, when I compare it with the small service that I have rendered. But it does this also: it furnishes another bond binding me still more strictly so to live my life that France, who bestowed it upon me, shall never have cause to regret that she was generous enough to embrace me in that circle of men who have won her august approval. (Great applause.)

I will now call upon a man who has risen to the highest position he can attain in his department of work, a man who has been trusted by his fellow men, who enjoys the confidence of the workingmen of the Republic and who has earned the respect and the confidence of the employers, with whom he comes in contact as an equal; a name highly respected, one you will be glad to hear; one whose voice in the cause of Peace is a potential voice, because he reaches the great masses upon whom, in a republican country, we must depend for success in any cause we embrace. I have great pleasure in introducing to you Samuel Gompers, Esq., President of the American Federation of Labor. (Applause.)

MR. GOMPERS:

MR. TOASTMASTER, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: It is quite in keeping with the great cause of labor, which I have the honor to represent here, for me to have accepted the invitation to address this magnificent assemblage upon the subject now so conspicuously occupying the minds of the earnest, thinking, humane men of our time—the horrors of war, and the movement to substitute for them the more humane methods, for the establishment and maintenance of Peace among the nations of the world. For quite apart from the altruistic and humane sentiments which the working men share with others in the effort to abolish the arbitrament of international disputes by resort to war, the workmen recognize that though others may fall, the brunt of war is borne by them, not only upon the battlefield itself, but in bearing the burdens which follow war.

Of all the people who suffer from war, the toilers are most intensely interested. They are the great burden-bearers of its

resultant horrors and sufferings. It is, therefore, not difficult to discern why they have from their first gatherings, and at almost every gathering thereafter, committed themselves unalterably and vitally to the abolition of war, through a duly constituted international court of arbitration for the adjudication of all international contentions which cannot be settled through the ordinary channels of conciliation and diplomacy.

It is a source of satisfaction and pride to recall the fact that the American Federation of Labor, in its convention in 1887 at Baltimore, heartily welcomed that pioneer of international arbitration, William Randal Cremer, the union stonecutter, member of Parliament of England, and unanimously declared in favor of an arbitration treaty between that country and the United States, a course which labor has, through our organized movement since that time, consistently and persistently pressed home upon the conscience of our people.

In a gathering of this character it is not necessary to dwell in detail, or in figures, upon the almost fabulous sums of money entailed in the cost of wars, the cost of standing armies and navies, not even their cost when maintained upon what is ludicrously termed a "Peace footing." These figures can be obtained by any one who cares to know. It is sufficient for us to know the immense increase within the past ten years in the cost of our own army, navy and armaments. It suffices us to know that it saps the very life-blood of industry and the standards of life of the people of other countries. If the barracks, armories and navy yards were transformed into school houses, colleges, universities, university extensions, manual training schools, schools of technology, libraries, museums of natural history, to air space, to breathing places, to improved homes, factories, and workshops, it would be found that the ravages of the white plague and its kindred ills which decimate so large a number of the human family, would be greatly decreased; if the thought of man were devoted to spreading the knowledge of the arts and sciences; to instilling into the minds of the masses the love of the good, the beautiful, the useful; to teaching man to emulate and vie with the best; to render to his fellows, and hence to himself and his, the greatest public service; it would make for the social uplift of all mankind.

War is the practice of the most consummate skill in the art of destruction—destruction of human life and human product. Peace affords the opportunity to develop the best that is in man, both productive and constructive. It is the noblest attribute of man's duty to man, the world over.

It is a travesty upon intelligence to assert that men trained in the art of, and organized for, war and destruction, make for Peace. Incidentally in every occupation or profession, an individual may see the wrong in it and protest against the tendency; but the men who have given either their whole lives or many years thereof to the study of the art of war must be expected to hope and work and bend every effort for the creation of an opportunity by which they can bring their art and profession into practice. It is as unthinkable for financiers to exist long without money, doctors without patients, lawyers without clients, wage-earners without work, as soldiers without war.

If we hope to reach the time when wars among nations shall be no longer, efforts toward its attainment must be made, not by those trained in the profession of the soldier nor by those who bind their faith in his influence for Peace, but by the men who love Peace for the sake of Peace and for the sake of humanity.

The working men of all countries often note with impatience the platonic declarations for the maintenance of international Peace, and for the spread of civilizing influences throughout the world, because they recognize that there is little foundation in them upon which to pin their faith.

Labor welcomes, without being carpingly critical, any effort which may be made to bring Peace to all the peoples of the world. Labor sincerely declares that the time must come, and come soon, when the world will recognize that Peace is as essential to the full development of industry, to commercial and civilized life, as is air to human life.

Organized labor recognizes that primarily the interests of the workers and generally of all the peoples of the world, are identical, and it constantly cultivates the spirit and bond of brotherhood.

Labor realizes the fact that industry and commercial competition constantly becomes keener the world over; that standing armies are often used for the purpose of opening up new markets

for so-called "surplus products"; that these entail the dangers of fratricidal wars between international competitors, and that, therefore, upon the shoulders of the intelligent, working wealth-producers, the wage-earners of all countries, devolves the larger responsibility for the preservation of Peace; that the voice of labor must become more potent in the formation of a great international public opinion, such a public opinion as before whose supreme tribunal both monarch and merchant must inevitably bow, and that wars of aggrandizement and greed must be relegated to the oblivion of the barbaric ages.

The expedient so often resorted to by rulers of foreign nations to stifle internal discontent is now no longer tenable. The people have tasted freedom; their lives are intensely interwoven in the world movement for its attainment; their souls yearn for its fullest fruition; their hopes cannot longer be diverted, nor their aspirations thwarted.

Among the masses there is an eternal verity in their aspirations for liberty; their historic struggles to emerge from slavery and serfdom into free men, and neither tyranny nor greed can long continue to overcome them. The bondman and the vassal of the past, typified by the man with the hoe, stand to-day upright, intelligent, with head erect, stout-hearted and determined to take their places among the men of the nations of the earth, no longer to be armed by a master or goaded on to venture their own lives in the effort to destroy the life of their brother man.

In all civilized countries there is an earnest effort afoot among people for national development to solve along evolutionary lines the material, political, moral and social problems confronting them. These must no longer be retarded or interrupted by brutal wars.

I come to you with the credential of the latest declaration of the organized labor movement of America, which, in the convention of the American Federation of Labor a few weeks ago averred: "We reaffirm the doctrine of international brotherhood and urge the trade unionists of America to join in promoting all movements having for their purpose the elimination of the cruel barbarism of war."

With that declaration clearly ringing forth the hopes, the aspirations, and the determined purpose of America's workers, I join with you and all others pledged to the high resolve that

war among the nations of the world shall once and for all be shunned from the face of the earth and give way to the higher, nobler, and more humane purpose of Peace and humanity. I come to you with that clarion call of labor, expressive of the hope that through the International Court, now established, resolve may be crystallized into eternal Peace. But, lest these hopes be dissipated, it may not be amiss for all to bear in mind that in the last analysis the masses of the people of every country have it in their hands to exert their own giant power to compel Peace, and that if otherwise thwarted, they will not hesitate to exert it. (Applause.)

MR. CARNEGIE:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: You know the time when the best wine was reserved for the last. Well, I am not going to specify quite so clearly as that, but certainly there is in every country some man distinguished for his virtue. In times of trouble and doubt, when the country hesitates, does not see clearly which way it ought to go, what is its duty, we have a man whose clarion voice rings out so clearly, so truly, you never have to pause for a moment to know just what he stands for and what he means; and he always means and he always stands for that which he sees to be right. We have such a man here to-night. The difference between British Universities, as far as I know, and our own universities is nothing more than this: that we have men at the head of our universities who speak to the nation from the high standpoint of disinterestedness and tell the nation, from their superior education and wider outlook, what the nation should do, what path it should tread—the path of righteousness. I call upon one, the foremost voice of that kind in this country—President Eliot, of Harvard. (Applause.)

PRESIDENT ELIOT:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: At this late hour I feel the urgent need of being brief; but I want to follow for a few moments in the steps of my dear friend, the British Ambassador, and to ask at this final period of this great Congress, what action we are prepared to recommend? I have heard, even very lately, many doubtful expressions as to the possibility of bringing a meeting like this to a conclusion which the statesmen of the world will call

profitable. Now, I do not want to deal with any vision or hopes merely. I want to deal only with established facts, with things done and reasonable inferences from things done, and with things which can be done before long. I want to point out what the past has realized which is of promise for the near future.

Our friend, Mr. Bryce, spoke of the common origins of wars, and described them justly in their most familiar forms. He seemed to me, however, not to make quite adequate mention of a very common cause or antecedent condition of war, namely, the dense ignorance of one people concerning the disposition, purposes, and qualities of another people (applause), and the distrust which results from this ignorance. Now, in this respect the world has made great gains during the past fifty years; we have recorded great gains in regard to mutual intercourse and mutual comprehension, and I believe that one of the next things we ought to do is to take careful, wise, practical steps toward increasing the amount of international publicity, and therefore the mutual acquaintance and mutual intercourse of one people with another. (Applause.) Conceive, ladies and gentlemen, what new powers we have for promoting this intercourse and getting acquainted. Conceive what new powers applied science has furnished the world with in steam communication and electric speech. Conceive how these new powers can be further utilized to this good end of mutual knowledge and sympathy. It would be better if the civilized nations of the world would unite in carrying on an international bureau of publicity, just as a few of the civilized nations united to keep blazing the great lighthouse on Cape Sparte, when the government in whose territory the light is situated would not undertake the duty of maintaining it. If we could extend that co-operative mode of action, so that there would be in every capital of the world, in every port where the exports and imports of two or more nations are constantly exchanged, in every great frontier city, and every great center of distribution, an impartial, intelligent, expert agent for international publicity, reporting steadily and with dispatch to one central publication office, an effective security would be provided for International Peace. We already know the way to organize and conduct such an enterprise. The news agencies of the commercial world have shown us how; the press of the world, the dailies and weeklies and the magazines have shown us

how. If the nations will not thus combine, four or five rich men, public-spirited, humane, desiring to serve their countries and the world, could do it without national aid of any sort. I would undertake to name—I need not name them—four or five Americans who together are capable of doing this great service to the whole world. (Applause.)

We have rejoiced in everything that has been said about the institution of the tribunal of The Hague, one of the greatest triumphs of civilization within the lives of those here present. But the good work is not yet finished. A court ought to have a force behind it. What sort of a force does the Hague Tribunal need? A police force. We have seen one example of certain civilized nations uniting to constitute a police force and using that power—the expedition to Peking. We know how the idea of a police force and the exercise of police powers have developed and improved during the last fifty years. This is a form of force which human society will long need, will need century after century—the protective force. It is the force that keeps order, that keeps the peace, that brings aid in disaster, and stands behind every court of justice with a power sufficient to execute the court's decrees. Now, that is the international force which needs to be provided; and again we know the way to do it. The nations of the world have taught the way within their own boundaries. An international police would be only an extension of the idea everywhere familiar, of the police force which now in all civilized communities protects the great majority of citizens against the disorders of a small minority. What a delightful reflection it is that here we see the way to maintain on a large scale that kind of force which should lie behind all government, essentially protective in its nature, and rarely used for any other purpose. I say that such a force will be needed for many a century to come. We need not regret it. When the angels sang above the plains of Bethlehem, they said, "Peace on earth to men of good-will." There are always in the world men of evil will, and force will be needed to control them. It is the moderate police force that is needed for that control, not the huge armies and navies. (Applause.)

Again, the world has learned and put in practice the doctrine of neutralization, and we only need an extension of that doctrine. How instructive is the lesson of the neutralization of

Switzerland, of the neutralization of the Suez Canal. How simple would be the extension of neutralization to all the great routes of commerce, provided we had an international naval police to enforce the neutralization.

I have thus far spoken, ladies and gentlemen, as if I did not recognize that human passion and human ill-will have had much to do with the warfare which has desolated the world. It is indeed true, however, as the British Ambassador said, that passion and misguided sentiment often cause war. Now, there is one sentiment which is especially apt to cause war, and sometimes the bitterest kind of war. I mean the sentiment about what is falsely called "National Honor." In spite of the immense visible progress made in the arbitration of disputes between nations—sixty cases lately in three years—we hear, now on this side of the world and now on the other, that there are questions arising between nations which cannot be arbitrated, because they are questions of national honor. That is a fearful misuse of the term. (Applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!") The honor of a nation is said to be violated if its flag is ever hauled down in a land over which it has once waved. Now, we of the United States have lately learned and taught something on that subject; we hauled down our flag in Cuba (applause) and never, never, was a more honorable act done by a government or a nation. (Applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!") Before that incident of the Russian fleet firing upon British fishermen in the North Sea with fatal effect, should we not have said that such an outrage would be held to have stained the honor of England, and that the stain could only be washed out in blood? England found another way to wash out that stain—a better way. (Applause.) If there were no other outcome of this Congress than this,—that we offered to the world a new definition of national honor, it would be enough. The duellist's notion of wiping out a stain on his honor by killing or wounding, is the one which has prevailed among nations. We need a purer, juster and more generous idea of honor. We need to associate with honor and courage, gentleness and justice. We should all abandon this barbaric notion of wiping out a stain on our honor by shedding innocent blood. (Applause.)

Time forbids that I go further. I trust that I have indicated practical measures, practical extensions of principles and

practices already at work in the world. We need not class ourselves with visionaries, with people who hope for the impossible. We desire to class ourselves with men and women who, seeing how much has been done wisely and effectively for the promotion of Peace, say—Let us go and do likewise—only more. (Applause.)

MR. CARNEGIE:

Ladies and gentlemen, the Secretary will now read letters and telegrams from the crowned heads of the world.

(Mr. Ely read selections from the letters and telegrams found on later pages.)

MR. CARNEGIE:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN OF THE PEACE AND ARBITRATION CONGRESS: I think it is time that we were getting a proper conceit of ourselves (laughter) according to these messages.

Now, I have an announcement to make to you. A gentleman who has made an address at the other banquet—and I am informed that there were even more people at that—as many at least as there are here—has kindly consented to come over and deliver the last speech of the evening. I take pleasure in calling upon him because at London at the Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, he rendered a great service to the cause of Peace by a suggestion which had Shakespeare's line in view,

“Upon the heat and flame of thy distemper sprinkle cool patience.”

And this suggestion is that before going to war, or committing any hostile act, there shall be time taken to produce patience. I have great pleasure in calling upon the Honorable William Jennings Bryan to address the meeting. (Great applause, the audience rising as Mr. Bryan took the platform.)

MR. BRYAN:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: In looking over the program and the list of speakers I find that you have heard some diplomats; that you have heard representatives of the wage-earners in the factories; that you have heard from the distinguished educator of Massachusetts; and your Chairman repre-

sents the industrial portion of our country, so I do not know why you should add a name to your list of speakers, unless you feel that the list has not covered all of the great industries of the country. I am sure that I am not here to speak as a diplomat, for I have not always been diplomatic. (Laughter. Applause.) I hardly think I am here to speak for labor, although I have worked rather hard for several years. (Laughter.) I hardly think I am expected to speak as an educator, although I have been engaged in educational work—but with indifferent success. (Laughter.) I do not know why I am called to speak unless it is to represent the great agricultural section of the country. (Applause.)

I have several capacities in which I might speak. I might speak as a lawyer, although the statute of limitations has run against my profession. (Laughter.) I might speak as a politician who has at last secured the most permanent title that one can have in this country—the title of “Ex.” (Laughter. Applause.) I might speak as a newspaper man, though in the presence of great editors of great dailies they might mis-spell the name of my little weekly newspaper. (Laughter.)

But if I speak as a farmer I can speak for a very large class of people, the largest individual class, and for those who, probably, more than any other class, bear the heaviest part of war’s burdens and enjoy the least part of war’s glories.

But I am not going to speak as the representative of any class. In the closing of this extraordinary assembly I desire rather to leave a thought that I believe to be an appropriate one for us to carry away with us. Upon the hearth of an English home the word “others” is inscribed, and the more I have thought of it the more it has grown upon me. The word “others” is an important word. It marks the boundary line between self and the world. Not until one has learned to know that there are others is he lifted out of himself and brought into vital contact with society. (Applause.) The knowledge of man’s relations to his fellows is an important knowledge and unless I mistake the definition of progress, we may measure man’s advancement by his conception of the meaning of the word “others.” I do not expect that we shall reach the point where man will not think of himself. I believe we cannot improve upon the plans of the Almighty; and when the Creator made each one custodian of

himself, made each one the guardian of his own interests, He intended that we should care for our lives and for all that pertains to our lives.

But there are two kinds of selfishness—the selfishness of the man who would lift himself up upon the prostrate forms of others, and the selfishness of a man who would lift himself up by lifting up the level on which all stand. (Applause.) I do not expect selfishness to be eliminated from the human race. Aye, more than that, I believe that the highest form of selfishness, the broadest regard for one's self, is to be found in the obedience to the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Applause.) For only by the recognition of the rights of others are we sure that our own rights will be protected. We have been so linked together that no one can consider himself separate and apart from those about him. We know not at what moment our lives may touch in vital contact the lives of others. We know not how our selfishness may react upon ourselves, or how our generosity may return to bless us a thousandfold.

It is fortunate that we are thus made a part of an indissoluble whole, that we are all bound together by ties that we cannot break, and it is evidence of man's advancement that he plans beyond the day and takes into consideration those who live, not only without his home, but in other lands as well. The savage will not plant a tree, because he must wait for the fruit. He will shoot the bird, because he can see it fall. But civilized man lays to-day the foundations upon which future generations will build. (Applause.) And the best foundation that man can lay is the foundation that is laid in justice, for the government that rests upon justice is the only one that has promise of perpetuity. (Applause.)

Reference has been made to-night to the message that came to the world when Christ was born, "Peace on earth, good-will toward men." I recalled that passage a few years ago, when we were about to celebrate a Christmas, and then my thoughts ran back to the prophecy in the Old Testament, when, several hundred years before the coming of Christ, He was described as "The Prince of Peace." I went back to refresh my memory, and I found the prophecy as I had recalled it, but I found another verse that I had forgotten, and I will give you the substance of it for fear that some of you may be as "rusty" upon the passage

as I was. Just after the coming Messiah is described as the "Prince of Peace" it says: "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end . . . and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." This is the foundation of perpetual government. As a nation is just, it is strong; as injustice finds place in a nation's object, it becomes weak, and justice bids us recognize the claims of others upon us. And yet, my friends, after all, justice is rather a negative virtue than a positive one, and I am glad that there is in this world something warmer and more generous than justice. I am glad that brotherly love goes beyond justice, and I believe we are entering upon an era where brotherly love is to be more manifest than it has been in the past.

I am not stating an original proposition. I am not bidding you believe it upon my authority. Thirteen years ago a great Frenchman, Dumas, said he thought he saw the beginning of a new era when mankind was to be seized with the passion of love, that we were to enter upon an era of brotherhood. And Tolstoy in Russia, two years later, quoted what Dumas said, and gave it his endorsement. I believe that Dumas was right. I believe that Tolstoy was right. And within the last few years I have seen more evidence than ever before of this new era of brotherhood.

Charles Wagner, the author of "The Simple Life," told me that he had sold more of his books in this country than in any other country, and I thought it was a compliment to our country, for "The Simple Life" is a protest against the materialism that makes man the servant of his possessions, and is an eloquent plea for the spiritual life that makes man mark out a career in keeping with the divine law and destiny. (Applause.)

Peace is not only one of the fruits of this era of brotherhood, but, reacting upon society, Peace hastens the realization of brotherhood.

I have one suggestion that I want to make, that we shall lay the foundations for a permanent Peace. You have heard the suggestion of the distinguished educator from Harvard in regard to publicity between nations and the making of people better acquainted with each other. I believe with him. My friends, within the last two or three years, I have been impressed with

the belief that the best way this nation can protect itself from danger from without is to make people in other lands acquainted with our country, acquainted with our people and acquainted with our institutions. (Applause.) And if we would spend ten per cent. of the amount we spend on warships and on navies, in establishing colleges here to which we would invite the youth of all the lands of the world, representatives to be educated here at our expense, and send them back with our ideals and a love of our people, we would protect our nation from attack more surely than by all the "Dreadnoughts" that we could put upon the waters. (Great applause and cries of "Good! Good!")

Let me therefore suggest that the purpose of this meeting is not only to present the advantages of Peace, but to present means and methods by which Peace can be promoted. One of the first things is the substitution of ideals of Peace for ideals of war. One of the methods is to teach that the way to overcome evil is not with force but to substitute something better for it. And, my friends, we will find no better authority than we will find in the Good Book, which says: "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." Tell me that you can only overcome evil with force! I say to you, if we can convince the world of our good intentions, if we can convince the world of our attachment to the world, if we can convince the world of our altruism, we will make friends of the other nations. I believe to-day America has more altruism in it than any other country in the world. I believe that to-day our nation is doing more in a disinterested way for mankind than any other nation in the world. And if any of you feel that we are to make our impress through commerce or through armies or navies, I reply to you that the people whom this nation sends abroad without noise, without celebration, who separate themselves from their friends and bury themselves in dark continents, because their hearts are full of love for humankind, these people who carry high ideals and open schools, are doing more for the world than we will ever do by showing new methods of killing people or new methods of increasing the destructiveness of a single man's arm. (Applause.)

And there is this, my friends, that the money we spend in this way not only helps those on whom we spend it, but it helps those who spend it also. For, unless every philosopher who has spoken upon the basis of Christian morality is at fault, every

From Stereograph, Copyright 1907, by Underwood & Underwood, New York.

THE BANQUET, WEDNESDAY EVENING, APRIL 17th, AT HOTEL ASTOR

man who does an unselfish act is blessed in proportion as his act blesses others. And we who gather to promote the cause of Peace will be rewarded if we succeed, not only in the bringing of Peace to others, but in bringing a Peace unto ourselves. We have our national ideals, and in the past we have erected monuments that have indicated what our ideals were. I am satisfied that there is a growth in ideals.

I saw upon the walls of a temple in Egypt the picture of a monarch who held in one hand the hair of a group of captives, and in the other hand he raised a club to strike a blow. What monarch to-day would permit himself to be thus pictured in his own land? (Applause.) There has been improvement, and yet I have seen, even in modern times, monuments reared, made of cannons captured in war, a glorifying of a victory over a fallen foe. I believe the time will come when we will get beyond the rejoicing that gives visible evidences of our having put other people to death. (Applause and cries of "Hear! Hear!")

I visited Windsor Castle a few years ago and I saw a piece of statuary. It was a piece placed there after the death of Queen Victoria's husband. I do not know who the artist was, but I think that it embodied a more beautiful idea than was embodied in the "Greek Slave" or in the "Winged Victory." It represented the Queen and her husband, standing together, he with one arm about her waist and the other hand pointing upwards, and beneath it said: "Lured to brighter lands, and led the way." Let the emblems of our nation rather picture helpful service than triumph by force, and I know of no better emblem for any nation than an emblem that will picture us as going forward in every good work and leading others with us and loving them and being loved by them. I thank you. (Great applause.)

MR. CARNEGIE: We will all join in the singing of "My Country, 'Tis of Thee."

(The audience rose and joined in the hymn.)

MR. CARNEGIE: Good night! Good night!

(The audience responded to Mr. Carnegie's salutation and the banquet came to an end.)

THE BANQUET AT THE WALDORF-ASTORIA

Wednesday Evening, April Seventeenth

HON. SETH LOW Presiding

MR. LOW:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: On behalf of the Committee of Arrangements, I welcome you here this evening. You know it is said, and I believe it to be true, that there is no moment at which a man is so likely to be at Peace with all the world as after a good dinner. (Laughter and applause.)

I hope that is equally the case with the ladies present. (Laughter.) As I recall the days of controversy that have marked the different meetings of the Peace Congress, it is no small satisfaction to the presiding officer to know that the speeches made on this occasion are to be made under such favorable auspices. I feel it to be my duty, however, to give you, or to sound, two notes of warning, to the speakers of the evening. The first is that if there is any disagreement with the Chairman, the matter shall be referred to the Hague Tribunal. (Laughter and applause.) If, on the other hand, it is only a difference between themselves, they may settle it as they please. (Applause and laughter.)

The second suggestion is made necessary by the number of speakers to whom we hope to have the pleasure of listening before the evening is over. Some are to come to us from the other dinner. Earl Grey, for example, and Mr. Bryce, are both expected here later in the evening. (Applause.) The Baron d'Estournelles de Constant and Mr. Bryan, after speaking here, will go to the Hotel Astor to speak there. Somebody says that, "a fair exchange is no robbery." (Laughter and applause.) I hope that the people at the Astor will think that they have made a fair exchange, as we of the Hotel Waldorf feel that we are giving a very good equivalent for what we shall get. (Laughter and applause.)

But, after viewing the list of the speakers who are to address you, I think I must point out the moral of my next warning through the guise of an anecdote; it is of a Boston girl of whom I have always been very fond. (Laughter and applause.) She was riding in the cars—in the street-car, reading her Emerson, with her muff by her side; she was not particularly conscious of a Harvard student sitting by her, until she suddenly felt his hand clasping hers in her muff. She looked up from her page for a moment and caught his eye, and said, "Sir, I will give you just ten minutes to take your hand out of my muff." (Laughter and applause.) I think there is no necessity of making the application any more direct to the speakers who are to follow me.

My conception of the duty of the Chairman, however, is not that he is to make a speech. He is only to open the way for those who are to do the speaking.

I shall ask time, only, therefore, to set before you one question for your reflection. You remember, I am sure, Stockton's conundrum of the Lady and the Tiger. I want to put a conundrum before you. When Tennyson wrote that immortal line about "The parliament of man, the federation of the world," was it a poet's dream or a poet's vision? A good many will tell you it was only a dream, but I want to give you my reason for believing it was a vision, and give it in the words of James Russell Lowell: in the words which, in his poem on Columbus, he put into the mouth of the great discoverer, as he soliloquized upon the deck of his ship on that fateful day which his sailors agreed to give him before they insisted upon turning back: that day which sufficed to discover a new world.

"For I believed the poets, it is they
Who gather wisdom from the central deep
And listening to the inner flow of things,
Speak to the age out of eternity."

That is why I believe Tennyson's immortal lines were a vision and not a dream.

I have now the very great pleasure of presenting to you my dear friend, Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, who goes from us to the other dinner.

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I wish my dear friend, the Hon. Seth Low, would have delivered this speech for me; it was such an agreeable thing for me to listen to him, and it is difficult for a foreigner to have to thank you in English for your kind reception,—I do not say to address you, but to try to address you in English.

While I was sitting here at the table I was thinking of the duty of that expression, of the duty I have to fulfil, and I remembered the story all of you certainly know very well, but which I did not, the story of poor Daniel in the lion's den. It has been told to me here, and I find it very fine, especially to-night. I could see that poor Daniel, who had been sent down to the lion's den. The cruel, barbarian king was looking at him, surprised to see that Daniel was not displeased at all, but that he seemed, on the contrary, very happy. The king was rather disappointed. He thought Daniel would cry, and ask for mercy. Not at all! The king said, "What is the matter with you,—why are you so pleased now?" "Great king," replied Daniel, "it is because I know that there will be no speeches when the meal is over."

I must try to express the feeling of gratitude that we foreigners will all take back to our own countries after your splendid reception. It is something more than gratitude. Without willingly flattering you I want to tell you that we have had a double supply with what we have seen in America; such a splendid gathering of the representatives of the government, of the public powers, of all the branches of American activity,—all to greet, to applaud this idea of Arbitration, of Peace, of the organization of the Peace Movement. That means a great deal. That means a great progress achieved for me. How different it was only a very few years ago. When I was at school we were only speaking of such things, and now wonderful things may happen in a very few years.

Five or six years ago the people who ought to have encouraged this idea of arbitration and justice, and the application of arbitration to war, preferred to laugh at it. They preferred not to believe in it, and affairs might have gone on like that possibly years more, but for the American people, who gave

another turn to the ideas, and more than a turn,—a good example,—and now this example of your great country has been so well understood that almost all the governments, almost all of the people, who were against the idea of arbitration, believing that it was a dream, are now quite favorable. They have no doubt about it. They are as sure of the future as they were skeptical in the past. This is a great result. I never realized it so fully as I did to-day and yesterday. Yes, chiefly yesterday. I saw one thing that I had not thought of speaking about here, but really I found it so fine,—it was the full realization of all my hopes. I saw not only the Government representatives, not only representatives of all the commercial, industrial and agricultural branches of America, I saw all the children of New York, (applause) ready to understand,—so wonderfully ripe for this new idea, which has been born fresh just as they have been born themselves. They are contemporary, it seems quite natural to them. When I saw all these charming boys and girls, so full of confidence, so full of faith, when I saw that, then I had a true vision of the future, I had a certitude which I never had before. I think our children are almost ashamed to believe that ten years ago the things which seem so natural to them, so humanely good, were considered a dream and impossible to realize. When I saw the faces of those children I had a feeling that I could go back to France satisfied that my journey was finished, that I could go back to France with the best and strongest lesson possible to give to my people. I should say to them: "You people of Europe, you don't mean to say that you do not believe? Why, the children over there in America—they believe they know." (Applause.)

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I know that you are all very busy here, even at the table. (Great laughter.) That is one of the things that I cannot really get accustomed to in America, that I can never have dinner without making at least two speeches.

But you will understand that it is not enough for us that progress has been realized. There is something more to do. We must be grateful to the people that have helped, to those who are responsible for this change.

Among the many people I see here, among the many friends who have given their cordial help, the help of their energy, of

their initiative, I want to name first our Chairman. I mean the Chairman of the Congress, Monsieur Andrew Carnegie. (Applause.) He has really done such good work in giving all his strength, and all his good-will, in the organization of this splendid and striking manifestation. It is not the first time that Monsieur Carnegie has given time and help to the cause of Peace and Arbitration. He did something five years ago that has had a very good effect and which has contributed to the great change I was speaking of. He saw that among the reasons why the people would not believe in the future of a Hague Court of Arbitration was that the poor Court had no home. (Laughter.) It is a fact almost extraordinary that for the baptism of the most magnificent palaces of princes, for instance, they fire salutes of artillery, they give splendid feasts of inauguration, but the Hague Court has never been inaugurated, for the very good reason that the Hague Court had no home. Monsieur Carnegie thought it would be a very good idea to give the Hague Court a home, and he gave the splendid palace which is to be built now. That has been a gift not only to the friends of Peace, but to all the Governments that have participated in the conferences at The Hague. The Governments have been happy to receive that gift, and I know at least one government which has been happy not only to receive, but which would like to show its gratitude for that gift. I am happy to tell you that I received very good news to-day which is one of the reasons why I have to leave you to go to the other banquet.

The Government of the French Republic remembered that one of the principles of our great movement has been that it is not enough for a man to be a good citizen of his own country, he has to try to be a good citizen of the world, and the Government of the French Republic thought that Monsieur Carnegie had done his duty not only as a citizen of the United States, but as a citizen of the world, and asked me to give him as a reward, as a particular distinction, this gift of the French Government, and the title of Commander of the Legion of Honor. (Great applause.)

I must tell you very frankly that I love my country very much, I love the French Republic, but I am especially proud and pleased to-night of what my Government has done. (Applause.) It is a great pleasure to me, a great and good duty

to fulfil. I am very happy to see and to find a proof that it is not only we, friends of Peace, not only we friends of international justice, faithful friends who have struggled in the past, but the Governments themselves who want to be right, want to be just in giving the right reward to the men who have done their work, and given their time, and their energy, and their good-will to the great cause of International Arbitration. (Applause.)

MR. LOW :

It does not make any difference to a Frenchman whether he speaks in his own language, or whether he speaks ours. (The Baron d'Estournelles here interrupted by saying: "Oh, I speak much better in French.") I dare say the Baron d'Estournelles could express himself much better in the French language, but he could not give utterance to any more beautiful or noble sentiments than he has expressed here to-night in English. (Applause.)

(The Baron d'Estournelles here remarked, "Ah, Monsieur President, you must not spoil me.")

We of America, whether we learn the language of France or not, can very profitably take a lesson of her, I think, in the nice art of courtesy which the Baron has so beautifully illustrated in the international recognition given by France to Mr. Carnegie.

I now have the pleasure of calling upon one who is the representative of our oldest university. Perhaps I may be permitted to say, as one who for a time was connected with university life in this city, that it has always been the greatest possible pleasure and happiness to all of us who have had to do with universities to realize how superbly, under the leadership of President Eliot, Harvard University has maintained her primacy, has maintained the primacy that is hers by reason of her age; it has been delightful to march in the column in which she stood leader. To-night it affords me very great pleasure to introduce to you Kuno Francke, of Harvard University, who will now speak to you.

PROFESSOR FRANCKE :

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I do not wish to appear to you under false colors. It happens that on this very day there is

coming out a little book of mine entitled "German Ideals," in which among other things I attempt to show the wide difference of temperament and thought which separates the cosmopolitan, idealistic and unpractical Germany of the days of Kant and Schiller, from the intensely national, realistic and practical Germany of to-day. And, although an American citizen by adoption, I should be false to my own blood if I did not rejoice in the astounding revival of national vitality, the superabundance of national activity, which has characterized the last thirty years of German history. The point which I wish to make is this: that this astounding revival of German national activity is by no means confined, as is often supposed, to military prowess, or scientific experimentation, or industrial enterprise. We have heard of late altogether too much of the gigantic strides taken by Germany in these directions. We have heard altogether too little of the spiritual awakening that has been the concomitant phenomenon of this material development. The spiritual, the philosophical and artistic ascendancy of Germany during the last thirty years has been as marked and as rapid as her political and her commercial advance, and every step in this onward movement has brought Germany closer to other nations, has helped the cause of international understanding.

Germany has always been willing to learn from other nations. She has always had her door wide open for every stimulating thought, every noble sentiment that demanded entrance at her gates. Her present spiritual revival may indeed be said to be due primarily to foreign influences. To indicate the extent to which the higher life of contemporary Germany has been stimulated by great personalities of other nations, it may be sufficient to mention four commanding names. An Englishman, Charles Darwin, has contributed more than any other man toward the shaping of what may be called the German lay religion—that religious belief which conceives of the Universe as one living whole, as a continual, endless striving for higher forms of existence, as an unbroken and ever-ascending line of spirituality. A Russian, and a Frenchman,—Tolstoy, the spiritual father of all modern mankind (applause), and Zola, the incomparable champion of social justice and right,—have done more than any other two men to stir the German masses with sympathy for the down-trodden and disinherited, with zeal for social reform, with the

conviction of the solidarity of the working people the world over. The greatest Norwegian of our time, the old Viking, Henry Ibsen, the indomitable fighter for individuality and truth, has impressed himself upon no other country as deeply as upon Germany. And nowhere have his teachings found the same response, nowhere are his dramas being performed to equally intelligent and sympathetic audiences, or with equal artistic understanding as in Leipsic, Munich and Berlin.

So much for great personalities from abroad who have been received into spiritual communion with modern Germany. But Germany is also being profoundly affected and inwardly stirred by great popular movements from abroad. From among these popular movements let me single out two, which may be called America's contribution to German life: the woman movement and the cause of educational reform. That both of these causes also strongly make for international understanding is obvious at first sight. The salient point of the German school reform lies in the emphasis put by the progressive educators of Germany upon the study of the modern world, modern languages, modern history, modern art, and literature and thought. Isn't it clear that an education based upon these principles, an education which makes the growing generation intellectually at home with the dominant ideals of the leading nations of to-day, isn't it clear that such an education must help in preventing, or at least allaying, international misunderstanding and animosities? For how could a man who had become truly at home in the spiritual world, at least of England, of France, Germany, or America, fail to recognize the close interdependence of the great modern nations, how could he but be filled with a desire to contribute on his part toward their mutual understanding and friendly devotion to a common cause?

As to the German woman movement, it has a dominant note of sympathy with life in all its forms, and of affectionate regard for individuality; an intense zeal for the rights of the weak and oppressed; of earnest striving for the peaceful regeneration of the world. All of this has found one of its most characteristic expressions in the lifework of that noble woman whose name, and whose work, is familiar to you all—the Baroness Von Suttner—whose appeals for disarmament have certainly

disarmed scores of critics and re-echo in thousands of human hearts.

Germans all over the world, whether German subjects or not, admire and are proud of the devoted and courageous, high-minded activity of the German Emperor. They see in him the typical representative of the restless striving of modern Germany for high achievement, and of its remarkable responsiveness to ideal impulses. For nothing, I believe, are they more grateful to him than for the fact that he has lost no opportunity for showing his keen desire to cultivate friendly relations with all other nations. His habitual recognition of men of talent and eminence, whether English, French, Russian, Italian or American, his ardent interest in the exchange of professors between German and American institutions of learning, his splendid gifts to Harvard University, are only a few expressions of this fundamental desire, the desire of the German people for a constantly growing friendliness and intimacy of international intercourse.

Let me close by giving to this desire one particular application. No greater blessing, it seems to me, can come to modern civilization than that the happily correct and friendly relations which now exist between Germany, France and England should more and more be strengthened into a firm and indissoluble friendship. If we reflect what these nations have given to each other; if we think of France's brilliant initiative in all matters spiritual, intellectual and artistic; of England's political genius and marvelous power of organization; of Germany's depth of feeling and philosophical grasp, it seems impossible to think that these nations should not henceforth always and forever stand together enriching each other, and working together for the good of mankind. (Applause.) The American people,—an *Ueber-Volk*, so to speak,—uniting in itself the Anglo-Saxon, the Teutonic and the Romance racial types, wishes for nothing more devoutly than for such an alliance as this, an alliance into which America's own natural instinct would draw her also, making it irresistible and inviolable.

MR. LOW:

Professor Francke has done us a real service, I think, in calling our attention from the most obvious thing to that which

lies behind it. We so often think of Germany as an armed nation, that we forget sometimes that the leader of that nation has constantly shown himself a friend of Peace; and we often forget, what we in the University world never should forget, that Germany has carried beyond every other nation two ideas that are essential to the making of great universities: first, the right of the teacher to be free in what he says. The teacher is expected to be true to the truth he sees, but he is thought of as false to it if he dare not give expression to what he believes. (Applause.) And because of this conception of the university professor in Germany, it consequently follows that the German student is equally at liberty to learn. He may ask any question of any of the sciences, and refuse to be satisfied with the voice of authority upon any subject, because being a student he is free to learn, free to question, free to think. Now, a nation that sets no limit to freedom in the intellectual world, is the last of all the nations not to welcome Peace among men (applause), because a breach of the Peace in itself is a limitation of freedom for the time being; but Germany holds up before our eyes continually that illuminating torch.

Now, I have great pleasure in presenting to you another speaker, who, after speaking here, will speak to our friends at the Hotel Astor. I might say many things of him; but all I want to say to-night is, that in his speech this afternoon I thought he placed this movement on a remarkably high plane, and left it there,—left it as a beacon upon the mountain, to give us courage to walk in the right direction, even when we cannot see very clearly beyond our next step. I have pleasure in presenting Hon. William Jennings Bryan.

MR. BRYAN:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: This Peace Congress has at least served one purpose. It has shown us that the nations which keep large armies out of supposed fear of each other, and build large ships for the supposed purpose of fighting each other are, after all, quite good friends when you bring them together, and have a free outspoken expression of opinion. I think this is a useful purpose. It cannot fail to have a good effect. And the manner in which these representatives have slyly admitted to each other the deep affection that they have been feeling for each other for

a long while, reminds me of a little story I heard a couple of years ago in the South.

A very bashful young fellow had courted his girl for a year before he had the courage to propose to her. One evening he told her that he loved her, and asked her to marry him. She was a very frank sort of a girl, and said, "Why, Jim, I have been loving you all these many months, and I have just been waiting for you to tell me so I could tell you." Jim was overcome with delight, and he went out and looked up at the stars, and said, "Oh, Lord, I ain't got nothin' 'gin nobody."

Now, after we have heard the representatives of the different nations tell how long they have entertained this secret affection, how impatiently they have waited for a chance to express themselves, we can feel that we might close this Peace Congress by unanimously declaring that, "We just ain't got nuthin' 'gin nobody." (Applause.)

In thinking of a subject which would be appropriate for this evening, it occurred to me that there is no subject more intimately connected with the subject of Peace than the subject of human life. I think it is because the world is coming to have a larger view of human life, and the value of the individual to the world, that it looks with increasing dread upon the slaughter of mankind. I know the people sing of the glory of war. They tell us of the heroic deeds, they speak of the inspiration that this higher act of human sacrifice brings to the world, but the burden of proof is on the advocate of war to show that war's blessings exceed its evils. It is not sufficient that we should count merely the good drawn from the lives of warriors; we must count the cost that war has brought to the human race. Who will measure that cost? Who will put an estimate upon the millions of lives that have been sacrificed upon the battlefield? Who will place a money value upon the millions of men who have died in camp, and on the march? Where shall we begin to estimate the value of a life? Shall we begin with the life of some one unknown to us, or with the life that is intimately connected with our own? If we would understand what war has cost, let us measure the affection we have for our own children and multiply it by the number who have fallen in battle. What is a life worth? What even is the life of a child worth? A child! Why, before it can lisp a word it has brought to one woman the sweet con-

sciousness of motherhood, and to one man the new strength that added responsibility imposes. Before its hand can lift a feather's weight it has drawn two hearts nearer together, and the prattle of its innocent tongue echoes through two lives. Who will measure the value of this child? When the child grows up there is not one day in all its life that it does not make its impress upon the world, and who will set the limit to the influence that it exerts? Shall we measure the value of the lives that war has cost? Let us measure the value of the lives that war has left us, and by the value of those that remain we can estimate the value of those that have been taken.

Think, if you will, how much one human being has added to this world's history. There was a time when people saw in the lightning nothing but that which would terrify, but one man conceived the thought that this lightning might be brought from the clouds and made the messenger of man, and now the news of each day's doings is flashed around the world. For centuries people had watched the escaping steam with no thought of its value until one had a vision of its power, and now steam is made to draw the burdens of the world, and has united the continents until they are closer to-day than communities were a century ago. Can you measure what man has wrought? I have spoken of two inventions, but, my friends, the impressions that one man may make upon the heart of the world are greater than the value of inventions. Is it a wonderful thing that by means of the telegraph instrument we can send messages 10,000 miles away? The achievements of the heart are greater still. The heart that is full of love for its fellows, the heart that yearns to do some great good, the heart that yearns to put into operation some great movement for the uplifting of the human race will speak to hearts that will speak to hearts 10,000 years after all our hearts are still. Who will measure the value of one human life to the world? What would have been the world's loss had Gladstone been lost upon the battlefield in the vigor of his youth? What would literature have lost had Shakespeare, as a boy, gone out to give his life in war? Measure, if you will, what we owe to Schiller and Goethe, or what we owe to Victor Hugo, or to Pasteur. Measure, if you can, the value of Jefferson and Lincoln, and then tell me how much the world would have lost had these great spirits gone away while their possessors were in their

youth, patriotically giving themselves for things that they considered just. (Applause.)

How shall we measure the cost of war? Let the advocate of bloodshed come forth with his figures, and prove if he can, that the blessings brought by war are greater than its cost. Tell me that liberty is more precious than life! Yes, but why shall we take the alternative of liberty or death? Why not liberty and life? Not liberty or death! (Applause.) Is war necessary? Has God so made us that we shall degenerate if we do not have an occasional blood-letting? Who thinks so? If any, let him tell us about how often we must have war in order that we may have a more rapid growth. How often must we kill in order that we shall not become effeminate? If this theory that war is necessary for human development is a sound one, then sometimes, in cases where wars are too far apart, we must go to shooting each other rather than risk the possibility of degeneration. Who will say that war is necessary to human development? I deny it! War is not a necessity! I could not worship God with the zeal I do if I thought that He made my advancement depend upon my taking my brother's life. (Applause.) I prefer to believe that war is but the evil that man in his imperfection has brought into the world, and is not a necessary part of the Divine plan. (Applause.) I prefer to build society upon the doctrine of human brotherhood rather than upon the doctrine of hatred and ill-will. (Applause.) And, we shall not have done what we ought to do in this Congress, and in similar ones, if we do not as a result of our deliberations give a new impulse to this feeling of brotherhood.

Surely the effect of these meetings must be to draw us closer together in the bonds of sympathy, and make each more interested in the other's welfare. With civilization, with progress, with rising morality, there must be a clearer conception of the extended relations which we bear to all others. First, there is the self, and the selfishness. Next, there is the family and the family tie, then the tribe and the tribal attachment. Then comes the nation with its national spirit, a larger world, where all humanity is knit together in indissoluble bonds. A poet has described an incident in the Civil War. He tells how in a fierce battle a soldier thrust his bayonet through a soldier in the opposing lines, and when he stooped to draw the bayonet out, he

discovered he had killed his own brother. He saw that the blood upon his hands was the blood of one reared about the same fire-side, and he was overcome with horror to think that he had taken his brother's life. It is a pathetic story! But, my friends, are they only your brothers who claim the same father and mother? Shall we limit by so narrow lines our attachments and our kinship? God speed the day when we shall so recognize the power that binds each human being to every other human being that we shall see in everyone that bears the image of the Creator a brother, and shall shudder as much to take his life as to take the life of one who lived within the walls of the same home. (Applause.)

MR. LOW :

It is a striking thought that the very word "justice," and the thing itself, had their origin in the Roman forum, on the pavement before the Roman Senate House. Wherever the Roman arms went they carried with them the Roman law; the Pax Romana, the peace of Rome; and the Roman justice. And, broadly speaking, as long as Rome stood for justice the Roman arms flourished. The thing I want to ask you to consider to-night is, that for more than fifteen hundred years the arms of Rome have ceased to be a terror; but the Roman law, the Roman love of justice prevails over all the continent of Europe this day, and in our own State of Louisiana. So that what we have to consider as enduring, is not so much war as justice. The question that was asked in this Congress is, whether we cannot obtain justice in better ways than upon the battlefield. Certainly the Roman justice has outlived the Roman arms, and the day is coming, we gladly think, when the decisions upon international controversies given in a court of justice will command more enduring respect than decisions had upon the battlefield. I do not suppose that any of us are so sanguine as to think that from this time on there will be no war; but we are certainly right in thinking that precisely as public opinion is encouraged to demand justice by the methods which have outlived Rome, and which Rome has thus established, by just so much we hasten the day when justice, and not force, will rule among the nations of the earth. (Applause.)

It seems to me that we ought to see here the face of the

new commander of the Legion of Honor, and I am going to ask Mr. deLima if he will not suggest to Mr. Carnegie to favor this company with his presence for a few moments. He will have a welcome that will do his heart good. May I do that with the authority of this company? (Cries of "Yes! Yes!")

It is evidently not necessary to ask for the other side.

It now gives me very great pleasure to present to this company one who makes his home in the Mississippi Valley, but a man who is at home on the Atlantic no less than there, and a man who is at home on the Pacific no less than here; a man whom we always listen to with respect and attention—the Most Reverend John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul.

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND:

We have listened to speakers pronouncing many names—names to which the world owes a tribute on behalf of Peace. I now pronounce a name higher than all others, a name to which, more than to all others, the world is indebted for Peace and for all that leads to Peace. It is most fitting that in a Congress of Peace the name be spoken, the name of Christ Jesus, the Saviour of men, the Master of the Christian religion.

Before His coming prophets had called Him the "Prince of Peace." At His birth angels sang "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men." Christ brought into the world the high principles which make for Peace, and since His day the Christian Church has perpetually preached and enforced those principles. Whatever efforts we make, whatever movements we set on foot, we need to bring into them great and high principles. Principles take hold of the mind and the heart of man, and propel him upon the great pathway toward which he is bidden to march. If we seek Peace, we must believe in the principles preached by Christ. Allow, for a moment, man to be mere matter, a mere animal, grown accidentally into power, and into intelligence—why should he sacrifice himself for the sake of Peace? Why should he strive for the good of others? The leading motives in his life will be self-interest; the great rule which will dominate him in the arena of action will be the victory of the strongest. Take man, individually or collectively, take the individual, the family, the nation, humanity at large, and tell all to look up to the great, living eternal intelligence, in whose

image all are created, who is the Master and the Judge of all; tell all men, all nations, to question that great intelligence as to what is their duty, and you have laid deeply into their souls the foundations of Universal Peace. Christ spoke for all ages, saying: "When you pray say 'Our Father which art in Heaven.'" No other enunciation great as this has ever been made; no other could ever be made, as leading to Peace. If God is our Father, we are brothers one of another, members of one family. We are not simply brothers to those of our immediate family, to those of our own nation; we are brothers to members of all other families; we are brothers to the children of all nations. National frontiers become slender lines when in the light of the Fatherhood of God, and of the Brotherhood of Man, we look across humanity. However divided men are by mountain ranges, by seas or oceans, they are still brothers, obliged by the command of their common Father to love one another, to serve one another, to refrain from doing harm to one another. This is the great principle of Christ's religion; the principle that makes most powerfully for Peace between men and between nations.

The Gospel of Christ is essentially a gospel of mercy, a gospel of justice, a gospel of righteousness. When men by themselves, or through nationalities, are guilty of injustice, they become amenable to the high tribunal of the Almighty; the thought of the Almighty bids them pause, as the thought of no other power that may be built up before their soul. Let us establish justice between nations; let us teach humanity that to take from another nation that which duly belongs to it is a crime before the Almighty, and a stop is put to a large number of wars likely to desolate the land. What usually are the causes leading to war? Not infrequently foul ambition, the thirst for the expansion of territory, the wish to avenge an imaginary insult, the ambition of greed, the spirit of vengeance—sentiments and purposes most sinful before the Almighty, most severely reprov'd by His law. If you wish Peace among nations you must bring before them the great principles that proclaim justice, charity and righteousness; bring before them the Almighty power, higher than all power in humanity, that commands justice and charity. This is what Christ preached, a gospel of Righteousness, of Justice, of human Brotherhood, and from the earliest days of the Christian religion Peace began

to shine upon humanity as it never had before. War did not at once disappear. It takes years and ages for principles to germinate and bear fruit; but the principles and the signs of Peace were visibly on the earth from the very first ages of the Christian religion. In Paganism war was absolute cruelty; it was death or slavery to be the prisoner of war. Wherever the Christian religion went the principles of Justice and of Peace grew stronger and deeper. If to-day public opinion has come to deprecate war as it never did before we must see in this beneficent growth, the expansion of the Gospel of Christ. If even the nations that had not known Christ are to-day willing to show mercy in war, they have learned the lesson of love from the nations over which has shone the Light of Christ's Gospel.

We should not say that Christ's Gospel makes war a crime in all cases. Conditions, we must ever admit, may be found when a nation has no other remedy for the ills that threaten it than to make war, as conditions may be found for the individual that authorize him to defend himself even with the iron hand. As the world is constituted to-day war at times may be necessary, but the spirit of the Christian religion is ever impelling us to so ameliorate our conditions that war will not be necessary. You, members of the Peace Congress, are obeying the spirit of the Christian religion, the spirit of Christ's Gospel, when you propose a high tribunal of justice, which in days of Peace and in days of war will proclaim what is right and what is wrong, and will impress upon the nations the duty to do ever what is right, and to avoid ever what is wrong, without incurring the perils of bloodshed, the misery and the death of the battlefield. The Peace Congress is a wondrous assemblage; it is permeated with the spirit of Christ's Gospel. As one of Christ's ministers I bid you onward. Never falter in the noble work which you have taken in hand until there is established the parliament of man, where justice speaks, where recourse to the battlefield is forever forbidden.

The more we have of Christ, the more we will obey the law of justice and of love. The more the nations are deeply and thoroughly Christianized the more strongly are they bound to the great idea of Peace. When in our love for our nation we seek its advance in higher civilization, when we strive to secure for it happiness and prosperity, and to establish over its broad

fields a reign of justice and of love, let us know that our first duty is to build up in the hearts of its citizens a holy religion. The nearer we come to the sky, the more ethereal become our aspirations, the more angelic we are, the nearer we are to God. What we need is not so much commercial houses, great and powerful cities, what we need above all else is the inner culture of the soul that will bring out the divine that is in it. The deeper religion is in the hearts of the people, the more surely will Peace reign—Peace in the mind and heart of the individual, Peace in the family, Peace in the nation, Peace with all men, Peace with all nations. Woe to the land where Christ becomes neglected and unknown. Woe to mankind and to humanity when the message brought by the angel is no longer taught: "Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, good-will toward men."

MR. LOW:

I have received a telegram from Consul-General Massiglia, of Italy, saying that although absent in person he is present in spirit, as one who has all his life practiced conciliation.

Nothing has taken place upon this continent which is of more interest than the steady growth of order and prosperity in our neighboring Republic of Mexico; and we all recognize that in its President, Mr. Diaz, we see a truly great man. His Excellency, Señor Enrique C. Creel, the Mexican Ambassador to the United States, is with us to-night, and is the special representative of President Diaz on this occasion, and I ask him if he will not kindly address us. (Applause.)

SEÑOR CREEL:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am proud to say that I have two messages to convey to you which are exceedingly gratifying to me. I have just come from the great banquet at the Astor, where we have been exceedingly happy, where all have enjoyed themselves in the most magnificent way.

Here I am, located in one of the most artistic and beautiful spots of New York, and one which is decorated by the most beautiful and charming decorations which we could have,—by hundreds of American ladies, in whose blue eyes, and in the bright brown eyes of Kentucky, which are so well known the world over, and in the black eyes of the Roman race, and the Latin race,

which are so interesting, and in the eyes of all I can see reflected the light of that inspiration of the great ideal which they all cherish, in which they all rejoice,—what the Peace Congress is doing to establish Peace in the world. (Applause.)

The news of arbitration has reached my country, has reached Mexico. It was received by cheers from the Mexican people. It had a warm response from the President, who instructed me to appear as his representative and Ambassador, to come to these two banquets and to express his views, which are in full accord with the plans of this Arbitration and Peace Congress. (Applause.) He was asked to be present, and regretted exceedingly that he could not on account of his official duties, the courts now being in session; but he is with us in spirit, for he is one of the great Peacemakers of the world. He has received with sympathy the news of the good feeling of the American people, and the important letter which was read at the gathering of the National Congress of Peace and Arbitration,—the letter of your honorable President, Mr. Roosevelt, and the remarkable speech that was delivered by his Secretary of State, Mr. Root. President Diaz regarded that as something very noble, something very important. We also regarded it as something important that no place was found large enough for all the people expected at these banquets, people who are here in sympathy with the movement of Peace. There is reason for this great city of New York to rejoice, this great metropolis of America, whose capital, whose energy, whose initiative, have contributed so largely to the wonderful development of this great country. Besides its efforts in economical and industrial ways it has been crowned with the love of Peace. That is why we are all rejoicing. It is true that the treaty of international arbitration has not yet been signed, but the next step onward has been taken. The initiative of the American people, the great interest which they have taken, is influencing the important powers of the European continent, and every move in public opinion, every move in the press, every move of wise and scientific men, is a strong indication that we are going on the right line to accomplish what we all wish,—International Arbitration and the Peace of the human family.

In this country this movement has for its head a very noble character, a man who had a brilliant career as an industrial and

Edmund E. Hale

business man, and who after accomplishing wonders along these lines and building a fortune which went into many millions of dollars, is now working on a higher standard, interested in the welfare of his fellow-citizens and in humanity, and in all the people of the world. You will recognize that I am speaking of Mr. Carnegie, of that noble character who has a universal reputation, of that one man who is being loved by the people of two continents, and that man who is setting an example for many people to follow, and whose good work we wish may have great success. (Applause.)

Allow me, ladies and gentlemen, to propose to you that we shall drink to the health of Mr. Carnegie, a noble man who is entitled to our respect and to our consideration. (Great applause The guests drank to the toast.)

MR. LOW:

I am sure that I speak the sentiments of this audience in thanking the Mexican Ambassador for the message he has brought to us from the Mexican Republic—from President Diaz. If we have ever doubted before, or ever failed to understand before, why Mexico has made the great progress in recent years that she has made, I am sure that we American men will fail no longer. A nation that appreciates so thoroughly the eyes of our American women is a nation that understands the wise thing to do. (Laughter.)

I am going to call upon Mr. John Bassett Moore, of Columbia University, who is certainly one of the first, if not the very first, of the authorities upon international law in the United States. Those of us who know him well delight to think he is one of the foremost in the entire civilized world.

PROFESSOR MOORE:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Your honored Chairman has by his kind introduction raised expectations which I feel that it will be very difficult for me in reasonable measure to meet. I feel, too, that coming, as I do, after eminent speakers who have entertained us with their eloquence, there has perhaps fallen upon me the duty of introducing that spice of discord which has been supposed to characterize all the meetings of this Peace Congress, and which our honored Chairman has intimated that we might

have before the evening was over. I find myself, however, in such complete accord with what has been said that, if I should attempt to disagree with anybody I fear it would have to be with myself; and that, I am sure, would not be altogether becoming.

I was delighted when I saw the Mexican Ambassador mount this platform a few moments ago with a message from the President of his country. I am justified in saying, from personal knowledge, that, among the many good things for which Mexico is distinguished, one of the best is the high character of the official representatives whom our sister Republic has sent to represent her in this country. (Applause.) It was my good fortune, my happy privilege, to know somewhat intimately, for a number of years, one of the most honored predecessors of the present Ambassador—the Honorable Matias Romero; a man whom I esteemed and cherished as a friend, whom I respected as a diplomatist, and whom I honored as one who, while intensely loyal to his own land, possessed that fine sense of equity which enabled him to appreciate the fact that justice is to be found not in the contentious insistence upon, but in the reconciliation of, differences. (Applause.)

There is one thing that has specially distinguished the Congress, whose sessions are now coming so pleasantly to a close, and that is, that it has presented, not a negative program consisting in the deprecation and denunciation of war, but a positive program on which something definite may be accomplished for the adjustment of international disputes and the bringing about of just results through legal methods. The great end to be striven for to-day by those who cherish the cause of Peace is the establishment of an international organization which shall insure Peace upon the basis of legal justice. The aspiration after the amicable settlement of international disputes is not new. But it is, on the other hand, equally true that there has been during the past hundred years a great advance among nations toward the definition and establishment of principles of international law and the adoption of co-operative methods for their enforcement.

In 1815 the Congress of Vienna, besides drawing together more closely the great powers of Europe, laid down important principles with regard to the navigation of international rivers and with regard to diplomatic precedence and procedure. The

Congress of Paris of 1856 adopted a declaration on the subject of maritime law. Then, coming down to a later time and passing over many other important international conferences we have, in 1899, the great Conference at The Hague, the distinctive achievement of which was that it formulated and incorporated into treaties which have since been ratified, codes of law on various subjects. Among these codes we are no doubt most familiar with the convention for the amicable settlement of international disputes, by international courts of inquiry to investigate the facts, by mediation, and lastly by arbitration. And now it is proposed in the resolutions adopted by the present National Congress, just as it was proposed in the resolutions lately adopted by that remarkable body, the Interparliamentary Union, that the constitution and powers of the Hague Court shall be so enlarged and strengthened that it shall not continue to be, what it is now, only an eligible list from which judges may be chosen, but that it shall be an actual court, always open to suitors and always ready to adjust grievances when they arise.

Is there anything impracticable or strange in this proposal? To-day, in a spirit of curious inquiry, I ran through certain volumes and calculated the aggregate of years during which the arbitral tribunals of the United States had been in session. Since we began our national existence we alone have had with other powers more than sixty arbitrations; and I found that the total number of years during which these tribunals had sat was a hundred and twenty-five,—more than the entire duration of our national existence since the formation of the Constitution. The excess of aggregate time is explained by the fact that now and then there were two or three tribunals in session at once. It is also to be observed that the total expense of all our tribunals,—and when we talk about Peace we always become very economical,—doubtless was greater, far greater, than would have been the cost of an actual court always in session.

So much for the idea of permanency. Let us now consider the classes of questions that have been adjusted by arbitration. I venture to say that, if you will look over the authentic records of our arbitral tribunals you will find that there is scarcely any sort of question that has not at some time been adjudicated by one of those bodies; not simply mere pecuniary claims, but claims affecting what we might call vital interests and national

honor. Take, for instance, the case of the *Creole*, a case that brought the United States and Great Britain to the verge of war, and that afterward almost caused a rupture of the conferences between Mr. Webster and Lord Ashburton, in 1842; a rupture which would almost certainly have resulted in hostilities. Who knows to-day what became of the case of the *Creole*? Hardly any one. And why? Because the case came before the Tribunal of Arbitration under the treaty of February 7, 1853, between the United States and Great Britain, and was disposed of so quietly that public attention never was drawn to the litigation.

Let us take a later illustration. One of the greatest negotiations of modern times was that which resulted in the settlement of the Alabama Claims, a negotiation conducted on the part of the United States by a man whose name ought ever to be held in honor by Americans, and without mention of whose name no Peace Congress ought ever to adjourn—Hamilton Fish. (Applause.) A man who, while others talked of Peace, made Peace and averted a deplorable conflict. When the adjustment of the Alabama Claims by arbitration was first proposed to the British Government, what was the answer? Lord John Russell replied that the questions involved could not be submitted to arbitration, because, as he declared, they involved the honor of Her Majesty's Government, of which Her Majesty's Government was the sole guardian. And yet eight years afterward those very questions, after careful examination and critical formulation, were submitted to the Tribunal at Geneva, and finally decided.

Again, what is to be said as to the pecuniary values that have been involved in these arbitral proceedings, and how many cases have been disposed of by them? I will take one single illustration, the arbitral commission under the treaty of July 4, 1868, between the United States and Mexico. The claims of the United States against Mexico before that commission were more than one thousand in number. The claims of Mexico against the United States were nine hundred and ninety-eight; in all there were more than two thousand claims. And the total amount involved in the claims, taking their face value, was more than half-a-billion dollars. One single claim against the United States involved fifty million dollars, and a lawyer so good as Caleb Cushing had advised the Mexican Government that it was valid; but on full investigation it was disallowed.

Now, as to finality. Out of all the arbitral awards to which the United States has been a party, there is not one that has not been carried into effect without the concurrence of both governments. Now and then, in rare cases, after the proceedings were over, some new fact has been discovered or some circumstance disclosed that seemed to render a modification of the arbitrators' judgment desirable; but on all such occasions the parties have proceeded to a final adjustment in a spirit of justice and equity, and have eventually arrived at a mutual understanding.

I once heard of a great teacher, a famous historian and man of letters, who displayed in his lecture room this sentiment, "Above all nations is humanity." In the display of this sentiment, he neither inculcated nor was understood to inculcate a want of devotion to one's own land; he neither deprecated nor was understood to deprecate that patriotic feeling which has in all times inspired men promptly to respond to their country's call, whether in peace or in war. But what he meant was simply this, that, as every man owes a duty to his fellow-men, so nations owe duties one to another; and he wished to create in his hearers the hope, which had with himself become an intimate conviction, that the time would come when the perception of justice by nations would be so clear, when their recognition of each other's rights would be so quick, so full, and so generous, that they would look upon themselves no longer as enemies, but only as friendly rivals in the course of humanity. (Great applause.)

MR. LOW:

When Henry Ward Beecher spoke in Glasgow, during our Civil War, he won the attention of his audience by asking, "What do you suppose was the last thing my wife said to me before I left America?" They naturally stopped to listen, and he said, "She said to me, 'Henry, whatever else you do or wherever else you go, don't fail to visit old Scotland, where every loch is a poem and every mountain a monument.'"

I am sorry to be obliged to say that Mr. Bryce, the Ambassador from Great Britain, cannot be with us. Although he is President of the Alpine Club, the number of dinners he has been called upon to participate in by a Peace Congress has so tried his strength that he is not able to come here this evening. However, he has sent to us a most welcome representative in

Sir Robert Cranston, the Lord Provost of Edinburgh, the capital of Scotland, and the capital of that fairyland which encircles the world and is dominated by the spirit of Sir Walter Scott.

SIR ROBERT CRANSTON :

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN : I think you all want to go home, and I am afraid it is a bit late for any man to arouse any assembly of this kind if he continues to speak upon the question of Peace.

Perhaps it may seem strange that I should come here, being for over forty-three years a citizen and a soldier, to speak upon the subject of Peace, but, I find in one of your President's addresses namely, William Henry Harrison, the following words : "As commander and defender of my country's rights in the field I trust my fellow-citizens will not see in my ardent desire to preserve the Peace with foreign powers any indication that their rights will ever be sacrificed." I think that is the feeling of every man to-day, to be ready and willing to serve as a citizen or as a soldier whichever his country may require. But at the same time I am perfectly certain that I speak the feelings of my own countrymen when I say that each of them are for "Peace on earth and good-will toward men." I know here, that you look upon us coming from the Old Country as being a little behind you,—we are behind you in many things ; nevertheless we are the mother country, and I think that if any country leads in Peace Conferences it should be Great Britain. She has often been spoken of as the mother country ; therefore, her first duty is the love, guardianship and the care of all her children (applause) ; if she is to be the mother of all the English-speaking races all over the world, then her voice first should be heard saying, "Peace on earth, good-will toward men." I am perfectly certain that this is the feeling of the great bulk of the nation. Our hopes are that this Congress will do good, that all these conferences will do good. There are people even in politics and municipal affairs who say, "What influence have I?" There have been gathered together in the City of New York six, seven or eight thousand people during the last four days discussing the best methods of obtaining Peace. "What does it come to in the end?" someone asks. It may not be noticeable to-night, but these people go out to-morrow bidding farewell to each other

after having talked on the subject, going into every part of the world, and carrying with them the olive branch of Peace, demanding that all nations shall cease war. If this Congress has done nothing else, it has sent out into the world people—and new people, as it were—to preach the Gospel of Peace, and surely it must be of some benefit. (Applause.)

To-night, while sitting in the other meeting, I thought of all these flags, not one of them stained or torn with bullets, and I thought of what was written over the head of a beautiful picture I once saw: "For God, for King, for Country." War is neither for God, nor King, nor Country, and surely the highest attributes of heavenly loyalty, guardianship and liberty of these people can be most easily obtained by spreading kindlier feeling all over the world. That will redound to the honor of God, and the honor of the King, and the satisfaction of the Country far more than any war can ever do. (Applause.)

I carry over from my own country to you the warmest and kindest feelings, and my colleagues and I go back more than ever endeared to this great nation, for during our whole visit we have found the warm hand of friendship, the big heart, the hospitable reception. Permit me to thank you kindly for the courtesy with which we have been treated. We must indeed carry back into our countries more good-will than ever, and bind firmer together nation with nation, which will glorify God and bring Peace and happiness on earth and good-will toward all men. (Applause.)

MR. LOW:

Sir Robert Cranston's reference to the flags which he saw in the other building reminds me of the beautiful line with which Whittier commenced his centennial ode at the Philadelphia Exposition in 1876. He began in this way:

"O, thou who hast in concord furled,
The war-flags of a gathered world."

It was under the inspiration of that thought, I am sure, that these flags, unstained with blood, were hung about the meeting halls of this Congress.

I have just received word from Mr. Carnegie thanking this company for the invitation to be here, but saying that his duty at the other dinner makes it impossible.

I shall now introduce to you, as the last speaker of the evening, a man who has the gift of clear statement beyond almost any man in the United States. I have pleasure in presenting Dr. Lyman Abbott.

DR. LYMAN ABBOTT:

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I believe that aerial navigators find their most difficult and dangerous moments when they are descending to the ground, to give those that have taken the trip with them safe exit. It must be, I think, because it is believed that I can bring you to the ground in safety from the flights of eloquence which you have enjoyed that I am asked to make the closing speech to-night. I take for my text the question which our President gave us in the very opening. It is this: "Is this picture of the parliament of the world, a dream of dreamers or a vision of prophets?" I believe it is a vision of the prophets and that we are nearer the consummation of that vision than most of us think. It is simply to state the reasons for that belief, as well as I can in ten minutes, that I have consented to occupy this platform.

The primal cell from which all social organism comes is the family. It is an industrial organization, and is based upon co-operation, and not upon greed or competition. Difficulties arise in these families, but they are not settled in respectable families by war,—not even by arbitration,—but by conciliation. In this family there is a public opinion which finds its expression in family conferences, and its chief executive in the father who is the head of it. In time these families are united in tribes, and the same triple bond of industry, of justice and of public opinion holds the family together in a tribe, but does not operate outside of the tribe. Then several tribes come in time to be combined in a province or principality, and within the province or principality, as within the tribe, the same triple bond operates, but not outside of it. By and by the provinces or principalities come to be combined in a nation. Perhaps the most striking illustration of that in history is our own thirteen colonies united in one federal republic, bound together by this triple cord—commerce, without any hindrance by the States, law expressed by the Supreme Court over all the States, and public opinion finding its organic expression in the Congress of the States. Families

have been brought together in the tribe, and the tribes in the province, and the province in the nation, and why not nations in a world? For what is our history, has been the history of every other nation, in form different, but in spirit essentially the same. The Anglo-Saxon kingdoms have been united in Great Britain, the warring provinces of France in the kingdom of France, the petty provinces of Germany in the great empire of Germany, the hostile provinces of Italy in a free and united Italy. Why should this process stop? Why not carry it on? We are met in this Congress not simply to find some way to ameliorate the horrors of war, not simply to provide new regulations of war, not to lighten the war taxes, not to lessen the number of wars, not to devise some method by which sporadic and exceptional cases of difficulty between nations may be submitted to peaceful arbitration. We are engaged in this Congress—and in a little while some of our fellow-citizens will be engaged in that larger Conference at The Hague—in carrying on this gradual process of organization to its legitimate, necessary and logical conclusion.

What does this mean? It means a commerce that will be a bond of union, not a method of separation; a commerce that will not be war; a commerce that will not lead to bloody wars; a commerce whose watchword will be co-operation, not competition, or co-operation in service and competition only in ambition to render the largest service; a commerce in which every nation will recognize what to-day every merchant recognizes, that a good bargain is beneficial to both parties to it; a commerce in which we shall hear a great deal less than we hear now about the balance of trade being in favor of one nation and against another nation; a commerce which will eventually take down the barriers between the different nations of the world, as it has taken down the barriers between different principalities and different kingdoms of the nation, and will make of the nations of the world one great free trading combination. It means law for the settling of the difficulties that will arise in the family of nations. It means a Supreme Court of the nations whose writ will run through the world, as the writ of the King's Bench runs through all Great Britain, as the writ of the Supreme Court of the United States runs through the United States; it means the fulfilment of the prophecy of that ancient Hebrew prophet

who did not merely see the time when men would beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks, but who saw the time when law should grow out of Zion, when the voice of God, speaking through humanity, should have all the force in it that would be necessary, because there would be a universal consciousness in man that would answer to it—therefore the plough would take the place of the sword in the world. It means an organized public opinion. It means the coming of the time when America will regard the contempt with which the civilized world looks upon its lynchings; when Russia will regard the horror with which the civilized world looks upon assassination, whether practised by bureaucracy or autocracy; when Turkey will hear and feel the heartbeat of humanity; when the public opinion of every nation will be felt in every other nation; and when that public opinion will find its expression in a permanent Hague Conference speaking for the world, as the Parliament speaks for England, as the Chamber of Deputies speaks for France, and as the Congress of the United States speaks for America.

We are perhaps nearer this consummation than even the prophetic souls of our time imagine. Events move swiftly; and many concurrent events have, during the last century and a half, led onward toward this world federation. Electricity has brought all civilized peoples within speaking distance of one another; steam has made easy the material interchange of the products of their industry. On this side of the Atlantic thirteen feeble colonies have grown into a Republic which embraces half a continent, and a Pan-American Union is bringing the Republics of both continents into closer relations. Across the sea petty German principalities have been formed into a German Empire, and hostile Italian provinces into a Kingdom of Italy. Autocracy has been supplanted in all western Europe by popular representative governments. Japan has thrown off feudalism and adopted free institutions, and a hitherto amorphous China has begun to grow into a vertebrate nation. International law has passed from a vague aspiration to a custom possessing a real, though undefined authority. A Postal Union, an Agricultural Union, an Interparliamentary Union, have all been organized for conference of the nations on their common interests. International arbitration has been substituted for war in an increasing number of

cases, and cases of increasing importance. An International Tribunal has been formed, with the approval of all the civilized nations, to which they may if they will submit the justice of their respective claims whenever difficulties arise between them. A Conference of the Nations is this summer to be held to consider, among other questions, this: How can this Tribunal be made efficient, not merely, not even mainly, to prevent war, but to promote and to secure justice among the nations of the earth? And finally, religious faith is growing into unity, not of creed, not of ritual, but of service and of sacrifice, a religious creed making the people who a century and a half ago were fighting one another, and were persecuting one another, unite in such a Congress as this,—Jew, Roman Catholic, Protestant, Believer and Agnostic, in a common effort to bring Peace on earth and good-will to mankind. That is what a century and a half has accomplished!

We are not here to cry "Peace, Peace," when there is no Peace. We are not here to amuse ourselves with an ideal vision that has no reality. We are here to push forward to its splendid consummation that long process of human history which has united families into tribes, and tribes into provinces, and provinces into nations, and our children will live to see the time,—my grandchildren, your children,—when the nations of the earth will be bound together by this triple cord—an unrestricted commerce, international law, and organized public opinion: a commerce the inspiration of which will be mutual service, the object of which will be the common welfare; international law interpreted by an international tribunal which will substitute in all differences between nations the appeal to conscience for the appeal to force; organized public opinion expressing itself through a parliament or congress of the nations which will speak for the thought and the will of the civilized peoples of the globe. If we read aright the history of the past and the signs of the present, we are nearing the consummation of history in the organization of a hitherto unorganized world. (Applause.)

MR. LOW :

Unless this company wants to begin all over again, this meeting is now adjourned.

OTHER MEETINGS

Religious and Ethical Societies

Meeting of Religious and Ethical Societies in the Broadway Tabernacle Church, Sunday afternoon, at 3:30, preliminary to the opening of the Congress, Rev. Frederick Lynch presiding.

This was a remarkable gathering. The great church was packed to the doors. The Chairman's address dealt with the growth of the brotherhood ideal and its hopeful augury for the new spirit of internationalism rapidly spreading over the world. He said that it was not only because certain things needed to be done that this great Congress had been called, but also because the leaders of the world's progress believed that the time had come when they could be done. The Congress hoped to put in motion new movements that would soon grow into action to secure the peace of the world. Toward the accomplishment of this nothing can wield a stronger influence than the church.

Dr. Newell Dwight Hillis was the next speaker and spoke on the Moral Damage of War. He was followed by Rabbi Joseph Silverman, D.D., who said the ages had been sleeping morally—it was time now to awake and be such men as the prophets foretold should people the earth.

The last speaker was W. T. Stead, of London, editor of the *Review of Reviews*. Mr. Stead told the story of his pilgrimage to the courts of Europe—a wonderful story. He spoke of the signs of promise in Europe, of the vague spirit slowly assuming shape, of the growth of international conscience, of the new internationalism, of the shame that the church was not more outspoken—not leading, as she should, in this great movement.

Student Meetings

A conference of student delegates representing a large number of colleges and universities was held on Tuesday morning, April 16, at 10:30, in Earl Hall, Columbia University, under the auspices of the Columbia University Arbitration Society (a student organization).

Dean George W. Kirchwey, of the School of Law, presided at this conference, which was attended by about 200 delegates, and addresses were also made by Professor John Bassett Moore and Dr. Ernst Richard of Columbia University, by Professor Clark of the College of the City of New York, President Henry S. Drinker of Lehigh University and by several student delegates.

After full discussion it was decided that an Intercollegiate Arbitration Society be organized and the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that a committee, composed of R. C. Masterton, Columbia (chairman); C. DeW. Pugsley, Harvard; J. B. Carlock, Lehigh; R. S. Sidebotham, Princeton; E. S. Whitin, Columbia; H. P. Barss, University of Rochester; E. J. Klein, Stevens Institute; H. R. Sayre, Williams; J. B. Farrell, College of the City of New York, be appointed, with power to add to its number, for the purpose of forming an intercollegiate organization to promote the study and discussion of international affairs, with a view to the dissemination of correct information, the removal of misunderstandings and the amicable settlement of international disputes on the basis of law and justice.

At the close of the conference luncheon was served to the delegates at the University Commons.

At 2:30 P. M. the Honorable William Jennings Bryan delivered an address to the visiting delegates and the students of Columbia University (including those of the Horace Mann School) in the Auditorium of the Horace Mann School.

Receptions

Monday noon, April 15th, from 1 to 2.30, at the City Club.

Tuesday noon, April 16th, from 1 to 2.30, at Barnard Club.

Tuesday noon, April 16th, at Barnard College, the Dean and Students of Barnard received the delegates from women's colleges, after which an address on the Peace Movement was delivered to the delegates and students in the Barnard Theatre by Mrs. Henrotin of Chicago. At the conclusion of this meeting the visiting delegates were entertained at luncheon at Barnard College.

Tuesday afternoon, April 16th, from 3 to 4 at Sherry's. The Patriotic Committee received the delegates from patriotic societies.

Tuesday afternoon, April 16th, from 4 to 6 in Earl Hall, President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University, and Mrs. Butler received the foreign visitors, the University and other delegates.

Wednesday noon, April 17th, from 1 to 2.30, at the Metropolitan Club. A luncheon was given to all the editors, foreign guests, principal speakers and officers of the Congress.

HON. GEORGE B. CORTELYOU
HON. WILLIAM H. TAFT
HON. VICTOR L. METCALF

HISTORICAL NOTE

EDWIN D. MEAD

The first Peace Society of America, or in the world, was founded in New York by David Low Dodge and his associates, in August, 1815. The Massachusetts Peace Society, which owed its initiative to Noah Worcester, was organized in Dr. Channing's study in Boston, in Christmas week of the same year. The London Society was organized the next year; and from that time on Peace Societies multiplied. But almost a generation passed before the inauguration of Peace Congresses. The first International Peace Congress was held in London in 1843. It was the thought of the English philanthropist, Joseph Sturge, the friend of Garrison and Whittier and other American anti-slavery leaders, and was first broached by him in 1841 to members of the American Peace Society in Boston. Our Society warmly endorsed it and commended it to the English Society, and through the co-operation of the two, the memorable London Congress was brought about. It was almost exclusively a British and American Congress, 294 of the 337 delegates being from Great Britain, 37 from America, and 6 from the continent of Europe. Perhaps the most important practical proposition considered at this first Congress was that of Judge William Jay of New York, President of the American Peace Society during the decade in which the historic Peace Congresses in Europe in the middle of the last century occurred, that an arbitration clause should be embodied in all future commercial treaties between the great powers. At the four subsequent Congresses the American representatives stood pre-eminently for the demand for a Congress of Nations, which should develop and codify international law and create an international Tribunal; and this constructive program, which our own day at last is seeing realized, was popularly spoken of in Europe throughout the decade as "the American way." It was an American, Elihu Burritt, who was the chief inspiring and shaping force for the Brussels Congress in 1848, followed by the great Congresses of Paris, Frankfort and London in 1849, 1850 and 1851. At both Paris and Frankfort there were more than twenty American delegates, at London more than sixty. The Paris Congress, over which Victor Hugo presided, and the London Congress, held in the year of the first International

Exposition and having more than a thousand delegates from England alone, were immense and most impressive gatherings, and in them the Peace Movement in the last century reached its highest point. They were followed by two important British Congresses, at Manchester and Edinburgh; and then came the Crimean war and the other great wars of that period, and there was a long interregnum.

The first of the present series of International Peace Congresses was held at Paris in 1889, the year of the Paris Exposition. Frederic Passey was its president, and the number of delegates in attendance was almost the same as at the first London Congress in 1843. The second Congress met the next year in London, Hon. David Dudley Field of New York serving as its president. The subsequent Congresses have been held at Rome, Berne, Chicago (in 1893), Antwerp, Buda-Pest, Hamburg, Paris, Glasgow, Monaco, Rouen, Boston, Lucerne and Milan. Of all these International Congresses that in Boston in 1904 had the largest attendance, its impressive feature being a series of great mass-meetings for the people. One of its results was an American delegation of over fifty at the Lucerne Congress the following year, a number five times as great as that which had attended the other Congresses in Europe during these eighteen years. It is earnestly hoped that an American delegation as large or larger will be present at the Congress this year, which is to meet at Munich in September. It is ten years since the last International Congress was held in Germany,—at Hamburg, in 1897; and this occasion should be embraced for a demonstration of American friendship and admiration for the great German nation, to which our scholars owe so great a debt of gratitude, and to which so many millions of our people are bound by the close ties of race.

In recent years the need for regular National Peace Congresses, in addition to the International Congresses, has been making itself everywhere more and more strongly felt. Comparatively few at best of the peace-workers in any country are able to attend the Congresses in other countries. To many the hindrances of foreign languages and usages are serious. It is important, moreover, to consolidate and organize the Peace party in each country, and by National Congresses to influence public opinion. France, which has taken the lead in so many of the

important Peace movements of the last twenty years, was the first to act in response to this widespread feeling. The first French National Peace Congress was held at Toulouse in 1902; and subsequent Congresses have been held at Nismes, Lille and Lyons. England was the second to act; and the Congresses at Manchester, Bristol and Birmingham in the last three years have been large and influential, giving new life and better direction to the English Peace Movement. The agitation for similar action in Germany is now strong; and the inauguration of German National Congresses is likely to result from conferences of the great number of German peace-workers who will gather at Munich in September.

It is at this juncture and with this background that the first American National Peace Congress assembled in New York in April, 1907. But the Congress had also a distinct American background. The Mohonk Arbitration Conferences, which antedate the English and French Peace Congresses, have in great measure performed the function of National Congresses for America for a dozen years. The education and inspiration in right international thought which they have given the country in the critical period when that influence was most imperatively needed, are incalculable. America's obligation to the consecrated and prophetic founder of the Mohonk Conference is profound. That stimulating nursery and school for effort in the great cities of the country will render ever larger service and have ever wider scope as the Peace Congresses multiply with the years.

Above all other preparations for the new epoch and larger activities of the Peace Movement in America marked by the assembling of our first National Peace Congress, has been the steady, increasing influence of our great Prophets of Peace, from the founders of the Republic, and from David Low Dodge and Noah Worcester to the present hour, whose lofty conceptions and inspired words have leavened the public thought. In this time of larger life and larger hopes we remember with gratitude and reverence the men who laid the foundations of our temple of Peace.

E. D. M.

RESOLUTIONS

STATE OF NEW YORK IN ASSEMBLY

ALBANY, N. Y., April 11, 1907.

BY MR. MORELAND:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION of Senate and Assembly of the State of New York, in relation to the Convention of the National Arbitration and Peace Congress to be held at New York City, April fourteenth to seventeenth, nineteen hundred and seven.

Whereas, The Convention of the National Arbitration and Peace Congress is to be held in the City of New York, April fourteenth to seventeenth, nineteen hundred and seven, therefore be it

Resolved (if the Senate concur)—

1. That general treaties of arbitration should be negotiated by the United States with all nations, granting jurisdiction to the International Court at The Hague over as many classes of controversies as the other contracting powers can be induced to transfer from the arbitrament of war to trial before a court of justice.

2. That the United States should declare in favor of a permanent International Congress composed of representatives from every nation, to assemble periodically and automatically for the purpose of suggesting such changes in the law of nations, and in the method of its administration, as the current of events may make desirable and practicable.

3. That pending the construction and successful operation of such an assembly and also the other machinery necessary for the effectual substitution of law for war in the international domain, the United States Government should adopt a naval program which will enable the navy to perform its duty—guarding our exposed sea coasts, distant possessions, our ocean-going commerce, also our interests and our citizens in foreign countries, and executing the just foreign policies of the nation.

4. That the Governor be, and he hereby is, authorized and instructed to appoint a suitable number of delegates to accom-

pany him to the National Arbitration and Peace Congress to be held at New York City, April 14-17, as representatives of this body, and to extend to the delegates from other State Capitals such hospitality as will be appropriate.

5. That the Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, to the Legislatures of the several States.

Agreed to by the Assembly,
A. E. BAXTER,
Clerk.

IN SENATE:

April 11, 1907. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the Senate.
LAFAYETTE B. GLEASON,
Clerk.

The delegates to the Congress appointed by Governor Hughes were:

SENATORS.	ASSEMBLYMEN.
George B. Agnew,	Owen W. Bohan,
Francis M. Carpenter,	W. I. Lee,
John P. Cohalan,	C. F. Murphy,
Otto Foelker,	Ezra P. Prentice,
Charles H. Fuller,	Leopold Prince,
Alfred R. Page,	Beverly R. Robinson,
William Sohmer.	Fred D. Wells.
	J. Mayhew Wainwright.

NEW YORK CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The following resolutions were passed by the New York Chamber of Commerce:

Whereas, A Congress for the promotion of a system of Law and Order as a substitute for war between nations is to be convened in this city on April 14, 1907, at the instance of men prominent in the cause of International Peace; and

Whereas, The Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York is deeply interested in movements tending to preserve friendly relations between this country and other nations and in the promotion of commerce; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Executive Committee be requested to take such action in regard to the Congress as in its judgment will be well and appropriate and in accordance with the principles of the Chamber.

The following delegates were appointed:

Levi P. Morton, R. Fulton Cutting, A. Barton Hepburn,
Cornelius N. Bliss, Marcus M. Marks.

BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION, PROVIDENCE

We are, individually and as a body, entirely in sympathy with the causes and purposes for which the Congress stands, and, as Secretary of the Association, I was instructed to communicate this expression to you as our unanimous sentiment. The importance of this Congress and its value to the entire world are inestimable. Each association of business men should be, and no doubt is, ready to do all in its power toward the ideal of commercial, industrial, and universal peace.

JAMES B. LITTLEFIELD,
Secretary.

MERCHANTS' EXCHANGE OF ST. LOUIS

The Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, through its Board of Directors, has repeatedly given expression in favor of International Arbitration for the settlement of disputes between nations, and, therefore, is in hearty accord with the movement for a National Arbitration and Peace Congress to be held in New York City, April 14th to 17th.

GEORGE H. MORGAN,
Secretary.

BOARD OF TRADE OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO

The Chicago Board of Trade is in hearty sympathy with the views and aims of the International Arbitration and Peace Congress, and recognizes the vital relation that exists between international commerce and universal peace. Commerce is promoted more than anything else by peaceful and friendly relations. Our foreign commerce can be promoted in no higher or more permanent sense than by preserving and cultivating peaceful relations with the nations of the world. On the other hand, there is

no more potent instrumentality for maintaining international peace than a growing and mutually profitable commerce between the nations of the world.

Commerce is the handmaid of peace and good-will, since it creates and maintains an order of citizens bound by their own interests to promote the public tranquillity.

GEORGE F. STONE,
Secretary.

THE BUSINESS MEN'S CLUB OF CINCINNATI

Whereas, There will be held in the City of New York on April 14th to 17th, a National Arbitration and Peace Congress, and

Whereas, The deliberation of such a representative assemblage cannot help but add material impetus to the establishment of universal peace, which would mark an era in the uplifting of all mankind; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Business Men's Club of Cincinnati, Ohio, hereby heartily endorses the aims and purposes of said Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That one or more delegates be appointed to attend said Congress on behalf of the Club; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of said Congress.

ITALIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF NEW YORK CITY

As delegates appointed by this Italian Chamber of Commerce to the National Arbitration and Peace Congress, we have the honor to convey the cordial greetings of the said institution and its full acknowledgment of the incommensurable services which the Congress is about to render to humanity.

As representatives of a commercial body, considering the question from the commercial point of view solely, we beg to state:

Whereas, War means loss of lives and consequently loss of labor, be it intellectual or material, depriving agriculture and industry of vital factors necessary to the development of land and factories;

Whereas, War, and preparations for it, involve nations in enormous expenses, whilst the amount thus squandered to kill and be killed could be used to foster vitality and wealth of the people, and

Whereas, From the prosperity of a country proceeds the progress of its commerce and industries; be it

Resolved, That the Italian Chamber of Commerce gives its full and hearty moral support to the National Arbitration and Peace Congress in its endeavors to accomplish the most needed and most sacred work by which the whole world will benefit, and expresses its hopefulness that the nations may agree on an International Arbitration Court, settling any controversy without bloodshed, loss in money, destruction of property, burdens of pensions, interest and all the other horrors of war and costly consequences of the maintenance of "Armed Peace."

JOSEPH N. FEARNOMINI, ANTONIO ZUCCA,
EGISTO MARIANI, ACHILLE STARACE,
ARTHUR J. STEPHANI.

THE MERCHANTS' ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK

Whereas, An International Arbitration and Peace Congress is to be held in this city on April 14-17, 1907.

Resolved, That the Merchants' Association of New York, through its Board of Directors, cordially expresses its hearty sympathy with and intention to further the present tendency to promote permanent peace and good-will between the nations of the world, not only in the cause of humanity, but as a necessary means for protecting and advancing the widespread and constantly expanding commercial interests of the United States.

The following delegates were appointed:

J. Crawford McCreery, W. H. McCord,
W. A. Marble, George L. Duval,
Daniel P. Morse.

BAND OF MERCY

At a Peace Meeting of some thousand Band of Mercy members and friends, held in Tremont Temple, Boston, to-day, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

Whereas, A colossal statue of Christ, called the Christ of the Andes, has been erected on the boundary line of Chili and Argen-

tine Republic as a monument of perpetual Peace between the two nations.

Resolved, That we respectfully ask the Peace Congress now in session in New York City to urge upon the Peace Conference soon to be held at The Hague, that similar statues of Christ be erected on the boundary lines of other adjacent Christian nations, and that no war shall hereafter be declared between such nations until the statue of Christ, standing on their boundary line, shall be taken down and destroyed.

GEORGE T. ANGELL,
President American Humane Society.

Some of the Letters and Telegrams Received, Showing the World-wide Interest In the Congress

THE KING OF ITALY

CATANIA, ROYAL YACHT TRINACRIA, April 13, 1907.

I thank you cordially for your kind invitation. I anticipate that the National Arbitration and Peace Congress—promoted by renowned benefactors of mankind—will be an important step towards the accomplishment of their noble ideals.

VITTORIO EMANUEL.

THE KING OF NORWAY

CHRISTIANA, April 11, 1907.

I beg you to bring my best greetings to the National Arbitration and Peace Congress, whose work I hope may promote the great purpose of advocating the peaceful settlement of international misunderstandings, a purpose in which the Norwegian people take such a lively interest.

HAARON VII.

THE PRESIDENT OF SWITZERLAND

BERNE, April 4, 1907.

Your favor of March 11th was duly received, and I appreciate deeply the honor you extend to me in the name of the organizers of the National Arbitration and Peace Congress, which will meet this month in New York. To my regret I will not be able to accomplish what you ask of me in your letter, but I am very happy of this opportunity to assure you of the interest I have in the work in which the Congress is engaged and to express to

you my most sincere wishes on the success of your work. Please accept the assurance of my deepest sympathy.

EDOUARD MULLER.

THE PRESIDENT OF MEXICO

MEXICO CITY, MEXICO, March 29, 1907.

I would accept with pleasure the courteous and honorable invitation which you have been pleased to send me under date of 27th of February last to assist at the Congress of Arbitration and Peace, which is to convene in your city, from the 14th to the 17th of April next, and to speak at the public banquet which is to terminate so interesting and timely an assembly on the approach of the Peace Conference. However, I cannot obtain permission from the Congress of the Nation.

During its next sessions devoted to fixing the budget and other grave questions, I shall be prevented from having the honor of being associated with the very distinguished persons to whom you refer, who are going to promote the noble and most important cause of peace throughout the civilized world.

PORFIRIO DIAZ.

THE PRESIDENT OF BRAZIL

RIO JANEIRO, April 16, 1907.

I take pleasure in expressing my deepest sympathy with the work that the National Arbitration and Peace Congress, at present assembled in New York, is doing in favor of the interests of international good-will.

ALPHONSO PENNA.

THE PRESIDENT OF CHILI

SANTIAGO, April 24, 1907.

Your letter of the 11th of last month has just reached me to-day when the meetings of the National Arbitration and Peace Congress are over. This delay has deprived me of the pleasure I would have experienced in expressing directly to the Congress the fellow feeling and interest which the people of this Republic entertain with regard to all ideas tending to insure peace among nations and to establish therein progress and cordial relations.

I congratulate Mr. Carnegie and the other promoters of the Congress on their patriotic work and trust that they may persevere in their commendable efforts.

PEDRO MONTT.

PRESIDENT, BRITISH INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

LONDON, March 30, 1907.

The great Congress which is to be held under Mr. Carnegie's presidency should mark a substantial advance in public opinion. The friends of peace are looking much to America to give force and driving power to the movement.

Our Interparliamentary Conference last year in London was signalized by a remarkable speech of the British Premier, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, in which he enunciated his unwavering devotion to our cause, and he has since shown in official action that he, at least, does not despair of some action being taken at the approaching Hague Conference in the direction of the limitation of bloated armaments, at present the scourge and the disgrace of civilized and Christian nations.

WEARDALE.

HUNGARIAN MINISTER OF EDUCATION

BUDAPESTH, HUNGARY, March 22, 1907.

The duties of my official position make it impossible for me to attend your meeting, but there is nothing in those duties to debar me from expressing my deep devotion to the noble cause and to the principle which the American National Peace Congress is intended to assert, not with unaccustomed splendor only, but, as we may and do hope, with irresistible efficacy. I should have been proud indeed to take part in its proceedings; to make my voice heard among the voices of so many illustrious Americans; to deliver a message of sympathy from eastern Europe to the American people arrayed under the banner of international fraternity; to bring an echo from the old world to the voice of the new one, to make it swell into an anthem of peace sung by the animated universe: nay, not an anthem but the proclamation of a set purpose, of an unconquerable will, that there be no more strife and bloodshed between the sons of God, but justice and brotherly love; the reign on earth of their heavenly Father.

This message, which I am prevented from delivering in person, let me send you in the shape of a few written words. Great as you appear before the world on account of your undaunted energy in every branch of human activity, of your unflinching devotion to liberty and democracy and your successful application of true principle to the building up of a powerful

political and social organization; great as the glory is which America derives from these proud achievements, she will rise higher still through the efficacious advocacy of international reform, which means after all but the extension, in some way, to the relation between nations of those principles on which the American commonwealth is founded. It is a path of pure glory which you are entering now, of a glory not defiled by the curse of its victims, but entranced and sanctified by the blessings of millions, to whom an advance in goodness and in happiness grows out of its warm light.

On that path we mean to follow you; may our common progress in it bear testimony to the energy of American leadership.

ALBERT APPONYI.

INTERNATIONAL PEACE SOCIETY

MILAN, ITALY, April 14, 1907.

The International Peace Society, Lombard Union, Milan, takes a great interest in the important event of the National Congress and sends to all the members of the Congress and the friends of Peace in great and free America, greetings and best wishes for complete success in the near future.

The glorious Federation of the United States is a symbol and historical example of brotherhood and progress to all nations. To-day it fulfils the high mission of civilization, and with all its force and with the enthusiasm of its brave race will keep on in the sacred work of maintaining solidarity and Universal Peace.

Over your important labors, oh, American brethren, presides in these days the immortal genius of George Washington, and as the anniversary of his birth is celebrated throughout the whole world by all Peace Societies as a symbol of concord and unity among all people, it is quite just to hope that the persevering and indefatigable work of the American nations co-operating with other nations will bring to pass the triumph of our sublime ideal.

The United States, which has had few wars, and those only for the cause of liberty and justice, is working and thinking for the holy principles of right and union among the people, and by means of free confederations has attained true civil Peace without ruinous and murderous arms. It was the United States that promoted the first International Peace Movement, and there the first two great Peace Congresses took place—the first the

Universal Peace Congress at Chicago in 1893, and the second at Boston in 1904. It was due to America that the terrible war between Japan and Russia was ended, for they acted as mediator between the two nations, thus realizing the hopes and desires of the entire world.

For all these reasons the United States of America, more than any other nation, is sacred to the cause and work of International Peace. All the sister nations of the world look up to you as to the lighthouse of civilization and Peace, which shall enlighten and guide all the nations of the earth in the future.

With these sentiments, oh, brethren of America, accept the greeting and loyalty of the lovers of Peace in Italy, who are present in mind at the meetings of your National Congress, and send heartiest appreciation of the benefits derived from your humanitarian labors.

Please accept, Honorable President, the assurance of our highest esteem and sympathy.

MONETA, President.

MUNICH, GERMANY, April 15, 1907.

Good fortune. Hope numerous American friends follow invitation Munich. QUIDDE.

THE INTERNATIONAL BUREAU DE LA PAIX

BERNE, SWITZERLAND, April 2, 1907.

On behalf of the International Bureau of Peace in Berne, we wish to convey to our colleagues, convening for the first American Arbitration and Peace Congress, a message of sympathy and heartiest congratulations.

This gathering is truly an important one, not only because of the many representative men and women who will be present, but also because of its principal object and leading thought. The second Peace Conference at The Hague must be a great stride onward in international friendship and good-will; it must form the basis of a new era of material and moral welfare of humanity.

May the old and new world unite for this great purpose, and may this plague of mankind, war, soon be banished from the earth.

A. GOBAT.

THE MINISTER OF THE NETHERLANDS

Washington, D. C., April 11, 1907.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs at The Hague informs me of a request made by the National American Congress of Arbitration and Peace which is to meet in the City of New York from April 14 to 16, that it may be honored by a message of Her Majesty the Queen, my Gracious Sovereign.

I am instructed by my Government to inform you that it is inconsistent with the constitutional traditions of the Netherlands for Her Majesty the Queen to give Her opinion on matters as indicated by the above said request.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs at the same time invites me to assure the National American Congress of Arbitration and Peace of the best wishes which he forms for the success of the Congress to which questions of the highest importance are to be submitted.

In acquitting myself of these orders I take this opportunity to offer you the assurance of my high consideration.

R. DE MAREES VAN SWINDEREN.

THE NOBEL COMMITTEE, NORWEGIAN PARLIAMENT

CHRISTIANIA, April 15, 1907.

Nobel Committee Norwegian Parliament greets American Peace Congress, assured United States continue glorious traditions advocating Peace principles. LOVELAND, Chairman.

I beg you to accept the following greeting from Norway: May the United States of America, which a century ago began to wave the banner of peace, see it in glorious splendor become the practice of the whole world.

May the United States, in which the energy, industry and cleverness of the Old World seems to be united, go forward, leading in the greatest work of this century—the work of Peace.

JOHN LUND, Vice-President.

THE SWEDISH INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

STOCKHOLM, April 14th, 1907.

The Swedish Interparliamentary Group herewith send their best and sincerest wishes to the Congress as well as the expression of their most heartfelt sympathy with its important labor.

BARON BONDE, COUNT HAMILTON, ERNEST BECKMAN,
J. BROMEE VON SCHEELE.

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN, April 15, 1907.

Seven hundred thousand International Good Templars send greeting manifesting their brotherhood.

E. WAVRINSKY.

VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA, April 1, 1907.

It is gratifying to see that this great subject is receiving more and more thoughtful consideration from the leading men of this country. The present generation can make no better contribution to the future than some means whereby questions which vex nations in their intercourse with each other may be honorably determined without a resort to arms. Our civilization is a dismal failure if we do not have enough intelligence, morality and courage to compose disputes between nations in some other manner than by recourse to war. We hail and proclaim the virtues and achievements of our heroes upon the field and upon the seas. We will decorate with the evidence of our gratitude those who shall win the greatest victory of all, and that is victory over war itself.

I wish you and those who are engaged in the promotion of International Peace a speedy realization of your hopes and your efforts.

CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS.

HEADQUARTERS GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, April 1, 1907.

As a soldier, I welcome every effort to promote Peace, and I trust that never again shall our young men be called to stand on the firing line to oppose any foe, foreign or domestic.

R. B. BROWN,

Commander-in-Chief.

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, April 16, 1907.

I regret that my official duties prevent my attendance at the Peace Congress and your Wednesday evening banquet. Although absent, my sympathies are very strongly with the movement in behalf of International Arbitration and Peace, and I believe it will be a great power for good.

Permit me one suggestion, prompted by the many communications I have received proposing different ways for bringing about the desired result. Let the Congress spend little time in considering such propositions. Matters of detail, of procedure, can be settled hereafter. The important thing is that this Congress, speaking for the entire nation, shall as its message to the approaching Hague Conference, declare in the strongest terms its belief in the wisdom and practicability of International Arbitration and Peace, and its call upon that Conference to take the widest and most effective measures to hasten the promised day of their universal triumph.

DAVID J. BREWER.

MISCELLANEOUS

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND, April 16, 1907.

Baltimore Presbytery now in session sends greetings. Micah 4, 3: "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

A. M. EAGLE, Moderator.

REDLANDS, CALIFORNIA, April 13, 1907.

I am inexpressibly pained that distance from home prevents my personal attendance at this Congress, which I consider one of the greatest advance steps toward universal International Arbitration in the history of the world, and for the organization of which America owes you a great debt of gratitude.

ALBERT K. SMILEY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 16, 1907.

The Conference of Church Clubs of the United States assembled at the Peace Cross, Washington, sends greetings to the International Congress of Peace and Arbitration, and bids it God-speed in its endeavors to promote the Kingdom of Peace and good-will among men.

JACKSON W. SPARROW, Secretary.

RICHMOND, KENTUCKY, April 16, 1907.

In 1888, I introduced a bill in Congress which passed, providing for an International Conference to consider Arbitration, which was endorsed. I am in favor of general arbitration treaty among nations and I shall make my best efforts in the United States

Senate for this great achievement. I hope the Hague Court will be increased in power and permanence.

JAMES B. MCCREARY,
United States Senator from Kentucky.

YAZOO CITY, Mississippi, April 3d, 1907.

I cannot too much impress upon you an idea, which I have talked over with the President of the United States, and which was embodied in a resolution of mine endorsed by the American delegates and referred to and carried over by the Executive Committee of the last Congress, which was held at London. That idea is to give stability and permanency and independence to the Hague Court, as well as dignity to its personnel, by having each country pay a good, substantial salary to the members of the Court appointed by it, by giving them a long tenure of office, either for life, or for ten or fifteen years, by forbidding them to act as counsel for any nation, while holding a place as member of the Court, thus enabling each country to select *international lawyers of international reputation* who can make a long work, if not a life work, of the objects set before the Hague Court for accomplishment. My plan further embodied the idea of making it a part of the duty of the members of the Court to collate the recognized principles of international law and to suggest to the nations of the earth amendments thereto, in furtherance of the general object of making arbitration, and not war, as far as possible, the means of settlement of issues arising between sovereignties. Of course, all the members of the Hague Court never act as arbitrators at any one time, but no member of the Court ought to be permitted to be an attorney before his fellow members representing any nation which has a controversy before the Court. It follows that in order to make it a great international lawyer's worth-while to take a place upon the Court—surrendering this privilege, that he should have a good salary. If the Court be given the dignity and prestige, which this would give it, then when matters at issue are left to controversy, they will always be left to the Court itself instead of having a government here and there suggest some other sort of arbitration. My idea is to make the Court of the Hague an Amphyctionic Council of the civilized world.

JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,
Congressman from Mississippi and Member of
Interparliamentary Group.

Representatives of Foreign Countries who Participated in the Congress

GREAT BRITAIN.

DR. JOHN RHYS, Head of Jesus' College and Pro Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford.

THE REV. E. S. ROBERTS, Master of Gonville and Caius College and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge.

COLONEL SIR ROBERT CRANSTON, ex-Lord Provost of Edinburgh.

DR. JOHN ROSS, Chairman Carnegie Dumferline Trust.

PROVOST MACBETH, Dumferline.

W. T. STEAD, Editor *Review of Reviews*.

SIR ROBERT BALL, F.R.S., Professor of Astronomy at the University of Cambridge.

DR. P. CHALMERS MITCHELL, F.R.S., Secretary Zoological Society of London.

SIR WILLIAM HENRY PREECE, F.R.S., Electrical Engineer.

MR. WILLIAM ARCHER, Dramatic Critic, *London Tribune*.

SIR EDWARD ELGAR, Musical Composer.

FRANCE.

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT, Member of French Senate; head of French Section of International Peace Conference.

PAUL DOUMER, Chairman of the Senate.

J. RAIS, Secretary of the International Conciliation Committee.

LEONCE BENEDITE, Director Luxembourg Gallery, Paris.

CAMILLE ENLART, Director of the Trocadero Museum, Paris.

GERMANY.

FREDERICH S. ARCHENHOLD, Astronomer, Director Theptow Observatory.

HOLLAND.

MR. J. M. W. VAN DER POORTEN-SCHWARTZ ("Maarten Maartens").
Author and traveler.

MAYOR GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN
JUDGE DAVID J. BREWER
HON. ALTON B. PARKER

Subscribers to the National Arbitration and Peace Congress

NEW YORK CITY.

Andrew Carnegie,
Miss Grace H. Dodge,
John D. Rockefeller,
Jacob H. Schiff,
Morris K. Jesup,
George Foster Peabody,
August Belmont,
Elbert H. Gary,
Thomas F. Ryan,
Isaac N. Seligman,
Alfred Nathan,
William Church Osborne,
Mrs. William Church Osborne,
R. Fulton Cutting,
John E. Parsons,
John Crosby Brown,
M. Taylor Pine,
Frederick Potter,
Charles A. Coffin,
Emerson McMillin,
John D. Crimmins,
James J. Hill,
Mrs. Russell Sage,
John S. Huyler,
Clarence H. Mackay,
John Claffin,
Clarence Whitman,
William F. King,
Society for Ethical Culture,
Seth Low,
Felix Warburg,
Otto Kahn,
Mortimer L. Schiff,
Cornelius N. Bliss,
W. Bayard Cutting,
Cleveland H. Dodge,
Herbert Parsons,
F. S. Witherbee,
Francis Lynde Stetson,

Nathan Bijur,
M. Hartley Dodge,
James Speyer,
Bishop Henry C. Potter,
A. R. Shattuck,
E. H. Outerbridge,
James H. Post,
Paul Fuller,
James A. Byrne,
Jacob Hasslacher,
Warner Miller,
John F. Praeger,
Henry Rowley,
Warner Van Norden,
John A. McKim,
Lewis Gawtry,
A. C. Hodenpyl,
William F. Allen,
James Talcott,
Elverton R. Chapman,
William C. Demorest,
Franklin Allen,
Fred C. Cocheu,
E. C. Schaeffer,
Walter Frew,
George Maccoullough Miller,
Anton Eilers,
Edward Lauterbach,
Charles A. Schieren,
Jefferson M. Levy,
Newell Martin,
George E. Blackwell,
D. P. Kingsley,
A. H. Bickmore,
Charles S. Davidson,
Marshall S. Driggs,
A. Abraham,
Stephen H. Olin,
John P. Dunn,

John G. Agar,
Adolph Lewisohn,
Gen. Stewart L. Woodford,
Ernest Thalman,
George H. Robinson,
William J. Curtis,
Jacob Ruppert,
William Ives Washburn,
Horace White,
Otto Eidlitz,
Henry Siegel,
Emil L. Boas,
Marcus M. Marks,
Oswald G. Villard,
Robert C. Ogden,

L. N. Littauer,
W. Morgan Grinnell,
A. S. Bard,
Paul N. Spofford,
Lewis H. Spence,
Paul Schwarz,
C. M. Wicker,
C. L. Bernheimer,
George F. Chamberlain,
H. W. Boettger,
G. T. Kirby,
Arthur Goadby,
William C. Choate,
Karl Miner,
James Ludlow,

W. Schmidt.

BOSTON.

Frederick P. Fish,
William M. Wood,
Robert Treat Paine,
Edwin Ginn,
American Peace Society,
Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes,

Mrs. Quincy A. Shaw,
Mrs. Dudley L. Pickman,
James J. Storrow,
Fred Brooks,
Mrs. Mary E. Atkinson,
Arthur Perry,

Joseph Lee.

PHILADELPHIA.

Joshua L. Baily,
Isaac H. Clothier,
Henry C. Lee,
The Estate of Ruth Anna Cope,
John E. Milholland,
George Burnham, Jr.,
William T. Henzey,
Asa Wing,
Francis R. Cope,

Walter Wood,
Elliston T. Morris,
Samuel Snellenburg,
John B. Rhoads,
William W. Justice,
J. Campbell Harris,
John Story Jenks,
Mrs. Evan Randolph,
George F. Edmunds,

John B. Garrett.

PITTSBURG.

George Westinghouse.

CHICAGO.

A. C. Bartlett,

Edward Morris.

NEW HAVEN.

Simon E. Baldwin.

COLORADO SPRINGS.

Gen. William J. Palmer.

The registered delegates represented organizations and institutions divided into the following groups:

Chambers of Commerce, Boards of Trade and other Associations of									
Business Men	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	166
Legislative Bodies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29
Bar Associations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
Municipalities	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	87
Mayors	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
Labor Organizations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26
Colleges, Universities and High Schools	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	167
Educational and Literary Societies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40
Newspapers, Magazines and other Publications	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
Churches, Religious and Ethical Societies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	285
Philanthropic and Reform Societies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	122
Peace Societies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94
Miscellaneous National Organizations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77
Miscellaneous Local Organizations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	120

DELEGATES

ALABAMA.

Mrs. Martha S. Gielow,	The Southern Industrial Educational Association, Greensboro.
Hon. John B. Knox,	State of Alabama, Anniston.
Mrs. John B. Knox,	United Daughters of Confederacy, Anniston.
Col. R. A. Mitchell,	State of Alabama, Gadsden.
L. B. Musgrove,	"Mountain Eagle," Jasper.
Mrs. G. W. Patterson,	State of Alabama, Montgomery.
J. W. Tomlinson,	Board of Trade, Birmingham.
Mrs. J. W. Tomlinson,	"Birmingham Age Herald," Birmingham.
W. H. Woodward,	Commercial Club, Birmingham.

ARKANSAS.

Mrs. R. C. Thompson,	David O. Dodd Chapter, United Daughters of Confederacy, Pine Bluff.
----------------------	---

CALIFORNIA.

Mrs. Jacob Baruch,	The Friday Morning Club, Los Angeles.
Prof. W. W. Campbell,	Astronomical and Astrophysical Society of America, Los Angeles.
Mrs. Frank B. Silverwood,	"The Ebell," Los Angeles.
Mrs. Fred W. Wood,	The Friday Morning Club, Los Angeles.

COLORADO.

Dr. James A. Hart,	City of Colorado Springs, Colorado Springs.
W. F. Slocum,	State of Colorado, Colorado Springs.

CONNECTICUT.

- Mrs. A. E. Abrams,
 Mrs. Alva E. Abrams,
 Mrs. C. H. Adler,
 Max Adler,
 S. M. Albarian,
 S. E. Baldwin,
 Hon. Morris B. Beardsley,
 Henry A. Bishop,
 I. W. Birdseye,
 Mrs. F. S. Bolton,
 Joseph S. G. Bolton,
 Clarence H. Bolton,
 S. Augustus Brush,
 Fred S. Camp,
 Rev. J. B. Connell,
 Mrs. Frederick Dart,
 Mrs. Mary R. Gale Davis,
 Samuel Lee Dibble,
 Rev. W. F. Dickerman,
 Robert C. Dougherty,
 Dr. F. B. Downs,
 Fred Enos,
 Rev. George H. Ewing,
 Prof. Henry W. Farnum,
 Charles Gay,
 Rev. Walter Gay,
 Gen. E. S. Greeley,
 Rev. W. O. Harris,
 Rev. Artemas J. Haynes,
 Rev. A. S. Hawkes,
 Rev. M. C. Hoefler,
 Winfield S. Huson,
 Mrs. C. H. Keyes,
 Frank J. Lindsley,
 Rev. Charles J. McElroy,
 Rev. E. N. Packard,
 Ralph S. Pagter,
 Rev. R. H. Potter,
 Harold I. Gardener,
 T. H. McKenzie,
 Prof. A. R. Merian,
 Halsey W. Kelly,
 James B. Merwin,
- Connecticut Congress of Mothers, Hartford.
 Hartford Mothers' Club, Hartford.
 Connecticut Peace Society, Hartford.
 City of New Haven, New Haven.
 Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford.
 Judiciary Committee, New Haven.
 City of Bridgeport, Bridgeport.
 City of Bridgeport, Bridgeport.
 Sons American Revolution, Bridgeport.
 New Haven Mothers' Club, New Haven.
 S. S. Church of Messiah, New Haven.
 S. S. Church of Messiah, New Haven.
 Greenwich Board of Trade, Greenwich.
 First Congregational Church, Stamford.
 Baptist Church, Wethersfield.
 State Federation of Women's Clubs, Niantic.
 Mothers' Congress of Connecticut, Bridgeport.
 Business Men's Association, New Haven.
 Connecticut Universalist Convention, New
 Haven.
 Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford.
 Bridgeport Board of Trade, Bridgeport.
 Bridgeport Board of Trade, Bridgeport.
 First Congregational Church of Norwich
 Town.
 American Economic Association, New Haven.
 First Universalist Society, New Haven.
 Union Baptist Church, Hartford.
 National Society Sons of American Revolution,
 New Haven.
 Union Baptist Church, Stamford.
 United Congregational Church, New Haven.
 Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford.
 Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford.
 City of Derby, Derby.
 Connecticut Congress of Mothers, Hartford.
 Business Men's Association, New Haven.
 City of Bridgeport, Bridgeport.
 Stratford Congregational Church, Stratford.
 Business Men's Association, New Haven.
 Connecticut Peace Society, Hartford.
 Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford.
 Board of Trade, Southington.
 Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford.
 Business Men's Association, New Haven.
 First Congregational Church, Middlefield.

Prof. Edwin K. Mitchell,
Rev. W. J. Mutch,

David F. Read,
James H. Roberts,
Mr. Ruecker,
Grace G. Seton,

Hon. Morris W. Seymour,
Judge Joseph Sheldon,
L. H. Stevens,
Frederick B. Street,
S. H. Street,
George S. Talcott,
Alexander Troup,
Mrs. Laura C. Tucker,

Hon. George W. Wheeler,
Howard R. Williams,
Albert R. Williams,
Henry Womach,
Prof. T. S. Woolsey,
Watson Woodruff,

Charles B. Evans,
S. Garland,
J. Harvey Whiteman,

Mrs. Katherine L. Eagan,

Mrs. Estelle G. Baker,
Hon. James H. Blount,
A. O. Granger,
Mrs. James Jackson,

Jane Addams,
George Fulk,

Mrs. B. Harding,
George A. Lawrence,
Mrs. W. J. Johnston,
Charles E. Kremer,
Thomas McClelland,
Judge Lambert Tree,
George Henderson,

City of Hartford, Hartford.
Howard Avenue Congregational Church, New Haven.

City of Bridgeport, Bridgeport.
Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford.
Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford.
League of American Pen Women—Washington, D. C., Coscob.

Society of Foreign Wars, Bridgeport.
First Universalist Society, New Haven.
Greenwich Board of Trade, Greenwich.
Business Men's Association, New Haven.
Business Men's League, New Haven.
City of New Britain, New Britain.
The New Haven Union, New Haven.
First Church of Christ, Scientist, New London.

Board of Trade, Bridgeport.
Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford.
Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford.
The Union Baptist Church, Stamford.
City of New Haven, New Haven.
Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford.

DELAWARE.

State Bar Association, Newark.
State Bar Association, Wilmington.
State Bar Association, Wilmington.

FLORIDA.

Woman's Club, Jacksonville.

GEORGIA.

Atlanta Woman's Club, Atlanta.
City of Macon, Macon.
City of Cartersville, Cartersville.
State Federation of Women's Clubs, Atlanta.

ILLINOIS.

Chicago Peace Society, Chicago.
Bethany Bible School Peace Society, Cerro Gordo.
United Daughters of Confederacy, Chicago.
Illinois State Bar Association, Galesburg.
Vassar Students' Aid of Chicago, Evanston.
State Bar Association of Illinois, Chicago.
Knox College, Galesburg.
International Arbitration Society of Chicago.
Third Memorial Church, Chicago.

INDIANA.

- Prof. Amos. S. Hershey,
 Mrs. Amos. S. Hershey,
 Albert E. Metzger,
 Leo. M. Rappaport,
 F. M. Ryan,
 Peter Scherer,
 Mrs. May Wright Sewall,
- Indiana University, Bloomington.
 Indiana University, Bloomington.
 City of Indianapolis, Indianapolis.
 North American Gymnastic Union, Indianapolis.
 International Association Bridge and Structural Iron Workers, Indianapolis.
 North American Gymnastic Union, Indianapolis.
 International Council of Women, Indianapolis.

IOWA.

- Charles Noble Gregory,
 Albert Cheadle,
 Pres. Hill M. Bell,
 Pres. Geo. E. MacLean,
 W. J. Patton,
- Iowa State Bar Association, Iowa City.
 City of Ottumwa, Ottumwa.
 Drake University, Des Moines.
 City of Iowa City, Iowa City.
 Sons of Veterans, Mason City.

KENTUCKY.

- Pres. Wm. Goodell Frost,
 Mrs. Wm. Goodell Frost,
 Rev. D. A. Gaddie,
 James K. Patterson,
 Mrs. Laura A. White,
- Berea College, Berea.
 Berea College, Berea.
 Green Street Baptist Church of Louisville.
 State College of Kentucky, Lexington.
 Ashland Equal Rights Association, Ashland.

LOUISIANA.

- Pres. E. B. Craighead,
- Tulane University, New Orleans.

MAINE.

- F. B. Milliken,
 Charles Israelson,
 Frederick C. Dearborn,
 Everett K. Day,
 Natilie Kirsch,
 Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey,
- Horace Purinton,
 Mrs. Alice Purinton,
- Board of Trade, Portland.
 Board of Trade, Rumford Falls.
 Board of Trade, Portland.
 Board of Trade, Rumford Falls.
 The American Peace Society, Eliot.
 Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Winthrop Centre.
 First Baptist Church, Waterville.
 First Baptist Church, Waterville.

MARYLAND.

- Rev. Oliver Huckel,
 J. V. L. Findlay,
 William W. McIntire,
 S. D. McConnell,
 Henry C. Matthews,
 Eugene Levering,
 Mary E. Garrett,
 James W. Cain,
 Mrs. W. J. Brown,
- The Pres. Cong. Reformed Church, Baltimore.
 City of Baltimore, Baltimore.
 City of Baltimore, Baltimore.
 State of Maryland, Easton.
 Lumber Exchange, Baltimore.
 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
 Bryn Mawr College, Baltimore.
 Washington College, Chestertown.
 Baltimore Suffrage Club, Baltimore.

Mrs. Elizabeth Y. Case,	Baltimore Suffrage Club, Baltimore.
Mrs. Robbins,	Colonial Dames, Baltimore.
Col. Oswald Tilghman,	State of Maryland, Annapolis.
Alice Thompson,	Colonial Dames, Baltimore.
George W. F. Vernon,	State of Maryland, Baltimore.
Gov. Edwin Warfield,	State of Maryland, Annapolis.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Clara B. Adams,	1884 Club, Lynn.
M. W. Alexander,	American Peace Society, Lynn.
Mrs. Fannie Fern Andrews,	American Peace Society, Boston.
Mrs. F. N. Barbour,	Winthrop Equal Suffrage League, Winthrop.
Rev. Charles E. Beals,	Prospect Street Congregational Church, Cambridge.
Rev. A. A. Berle,	City of Salem, Salem.
E. Blakeslee,	American Peace Society, Boston.
Rev. S. C. Bushnell,	American Peace Society, Arlington.
Rev. Andrew B. Chalmers,	Plymouth Congregational Church, Worcester.
Hon. Lloyd E. Chamberlain,	State Board of Health, Brockton.
Walstein R. Chester,	State Board of Health, Brookline.
Dr. M. Chirurg,	American Peace Society, Boston.
George E. Dey,	Young Men's Christian Ass'n, Somerville.
H. M. Dyckman,	First Congregational Church, Westfield.
Karl Eberhard,	North American Gymnastic Union, Boston.
Anna B. Eckstein,	American Peace Society, Boston.
William H. Frazier,	Second Congregational Society, Lynn.
Edwin Ginn,	The International School of Peace, Boston.
William C. Gordon,	Second Congregational Church, Westfield.
Mrs. William C. Gordon,	Second Congregational Church, Westfield.
George A. Fiel,	Business Men's Association, Waltham.
T. B. Fitzpatrick,	Boston Merchants' Association, Brookline.
W. G. Harding,	Business Men's Association, Pittsfield.
A. E. Hemphill,	Business Men's Association, Holyoke.
Charles C. Hoyt,	New England Shoe & Leather Ass'n, Boston.
Mrs. Charles C. Hoyt,	New England Shoe & Leather Ass'n, Boston.
George H. Huntington,	Hartford Theological Seminary, Milton.
Fletcher S. Hyde,	Public High School, Malden.
Dr. Theodore P. Ion.	Boston University, Boston.
William James,	American Society of Naturalists, Cambridge.
Elizabeth Kendall,	Wellesley College, Wellesley.
Rev. Albert Lazenby,	Unitarian Church, Lynn.
Mrs. Carrie S. Lewis,	1884 Club, Lynn.
J. A. Linen,	Williams College, Williamstown.
W. D. McCrackan,	Christian Science Periodicals, Boston.
Edwin D. Mead,	American Peace Society, Boston.
Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead,	American Peace Society, Boston.
Mrs. G. W. Metcalf,	American Peace Society, Boston.
Robert Treat Paine,	American Peace Society, Boston.

- Dr. Moses Greeley Parker, General Society Sons American Revolution,
Lowell.
- Victor H. Pattsits, American Antiquarian Society, Worcester.
Mrs. Mary A. Pettingell, American Peace Society, Boston.
Prof. Edward C. Pickering, Astronomical and Astrophysical Societies of
America, Cambridge.
- Mrs. Angelica E. Post, American Peace Society, Boston.
Hon. Josiah Quincy, City of Boston, Boston.
Francis B. Sayre, Williams College, Williamstown.
Sara Schryvier, Equal Suffrage League, Winthrop Highlands.
Helen H. Seabury, American Peace Society, New Bedford.
Mary B. Seabury, American Peace Society, New Bedford.
Mrs. George H. Shapley, American Peace Society, Boston.
George S. Smith, National Association of Clothiers, Boston.
Charles S. Soule, Somerville Hospital, Somerville.
Mrs. Emily B. Smith, The Whittier Home Association, Amesbury.
John H. Storer, City of Waltham, Waltham.
Mrs. Ida J. Tapley, Lynn Woman's Club, Lynn.
Benjamin F. Trueblood, American Peace Society, Newton Highlands.
Rev. James L. Tryon, American Peace Society, Waltham.
Lena Vesey, First Baptist Church, Stoneham.
William G. Ward, Federation of Women's Clubs, Boston.
C. M. Wheaton, Boston Peace Association, Newtonville.
Mary E. Woolley, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley.
C. J. H. Woodbury, National Association of Cotton Mfrs., Boston.
Prof. Münsterberg, Harvard University, Cambridge.
C. S. Hamlin, American Bar Association, Boston.

MICHIGAN.

- Clara A. Avery, State Federation of Women's Clubs, Detroit.
Homer L. Boyle, State of Michigan, Grand Rapids.
August F. Bruske, Alma College, Alma.
J. E. Hutchinson, State of Michigan, Fennville.
Francis W. Kelsey, American Philological Ass'n, Ann Arbor.
H. D. Luce, City of Lansing, Lansing.
P. F. H. Morley, Board of Trade, Saginaw.
Albert M. Todd, A. M. Todd Co., Ltd., Kalamazoo.
M. W. Tanner, Board of Trade, Saginaw.
John Prindle Scott, Board of Trade, Saginaw.
E. A. Robertson, Board of Trade, Saginaw.

MINNESOTA.

- Rev. C. E. Burton, Lyndale Church, Minneapolis.
Dr. James Wallace, National Peace Society, St. Paul.

MISSOURI.

- James Arbuckle, Foreign Trade Association, St. Louis.
Mrs. James Arbuckle, Latin American Club, St. Louis.

Hon. Richard Bartholdt,
Ella Boyd,
E. B. Brown,
James F. Coyle,
H. M. Evans,
T. K. Medeinghaus,
C. D. Parker,
Charles J. Schmelzer,

American Arbitration Group, St. Louis.
United Daughters of Confederacy, St. Joseph.
Business Men's League, St. Louis.
Latin American Club, St. Louis.
City of Kansas City, Kansas City.
Business Men's League, St. Louis.
City of Kansas City, Kansas City.
City of Kansas City, Kansas City.

MONTANA.

William J. Crittenden,
Mrs. J. A. Hoge,

First Church of Christ, Scientist, Butte.
United Daughters of Confederacy, Bozemen.

NEBRASKA.

Hon. Wm. Jennings Bryan, Lincoln.

NEW JERSEY.

A. L. Adams,
Rev. Sylvester W. Beach,
Mrs. M. G. Belloni,
William Biggart,
Joel Borton,

Stevens Institute, Bloomfield.
First Church, Princeton.
Women's Club of Glen Ridge, Glen Ridge.
Mayor of Bloomfield, Bloomfield.
Committee for the Advancement of Friends'
Principles of General Congress, Woodstown.
First Church of Christ, Scientist, Westfield.
Young Men's Christian Association, Montclair.
Women's Club of Orange, East Orange.
Wheaton Club of New York, Upper Montclair.
International Watch Co., Jersey City.
Young Men's Christian Association, Madison.
Drew Theological Seminary, Madison.
Consumers' League of New Jersey, Orange.
Public Schools, Bayonne.
Public Schools, Bayonne.
Political Study Club, Bayonne.
State Bar Association, Newark.
Public Schools, Summit.
Jersey City.
Stevens Institute, Paterson.
The Mayor, Bloomfield.
Consumers' League of New Jersey, East
Orange.

Charles G. Bliss,
Edwin A. Bradley,
Mrs. William T. Brown,
Mrs. L. E. Brown,
Ernest Bunzel,
Harold S. Buttenheim,
Dr. H. A. Bultz,
Mrs. A. D. Chandler,
J. H. Christie,
Mrs. J. H. Christie,
Mrs. Alexander Crystie,
Edward M. Colie,
Louise Connolly,
Andrew J. Corcoran,
C. Fred Cunningham,
Rev. George S. Curtis,
Mrs. C. W. B. Cushing,

Edward A. Day,
Mrs. Henry H. Dawson,
Mrs. W. S. Decker,
Warren Dixon,
Mrs. Herbert A. Drake,
Hon. Amzi Dodd,
Allison Dodd,

State Bar Association, Morristown.
State Federation Women's Clubs, Newark.
Political Study Club, Orange.
New Jersey Bar Association, Jersey City.
Fortnightly Club, Haddonfield.
City of Bloomfield, Bloomfield.
City of Bloomfield, Bloomfield.

W. H. Eldridge,	Schools of New Jersey, Williamstown.
W. O. Fayerweather,	Taxpayers' Ass'n of Paterson, Paterson.
Mrs. James M. Fisk,	Philitscipoma Club, Newark.
Rev. W. E. Fort,	First Baptist Church, Freehold.
Rev. Daniel R. Foster,	City of Trenton, Trenton.
William M. Gilbert,	Unitarian Church, Vineland.
Albert F. Gilmore,	Bates College, Upper Montclair.
Thomas P. Graham,	City of Paterson, Paterson.
Mrs. F. G. Green,	Wheaton Club, Upper Montclair.
Emerson P. Harris,	Unity Church, Montclair.
Mrs. Thomas S. Henry,	State Legal Aid Association, Newark.
E. S. Hersh,	Board of Trade, Elizabeth.
E. C. Hill,	City of Trenton, Trenton.
Samuel J. Holmes,	Congregational Church, Montclair.
Rev. J. F. Horn,	First Presbyterian Church, Whippany.
Samuel Huntington,	Unitarian Church, Plainfield.
Mrs. Samuel Huntington,	Woman's Equal Suffrage Ass'n, Plainfield.
J. Howard Hulsart,	Department Education, Dover.
Mrs. J. Howard Hulsart,	Department Education, Dover.
Rev. W. R. Hunt,	First Unitarian Church, Orange.
Mrs. W. R. Hunt,	First Unitarian Church, Orange.
Dr. Mary D. Hussey,	Medical Club of Newark, East Orange.
Mrs. Anna B. Jeffery,	Orange Political Study Club, South Orange.
Rev. Louis Herald Johnston,	Congregational Church, Ocean Grove.
Rev. W. S. Jones,	City of Trenton, Trenton.
Mrs. E. A. Kilborn,	Civic Club, Arlington.
Mrs. Kinsley,	Women's Club, Hoboken.
Rev. D. H. King,	First Presbyterian Church, Vineland.
M. H. Kinsley,	Department of Education, Hoboken.
T. W. Kirkman,	Stevens Institute, Hoboken.
B. J. Klein,	Stevens Institute, Jersey City.
R. L. Lane,	Stevens Institute, Hoboken.
Mrs. Arthur Lary,	New Jersey Society Daughters of Revolution, Jersey City.
Ada L. Lemhart,	First Church of Christ, Scientist, Jersey City.
Jeremiah Lisk, Jr.,	Civic Club, Bayonne.
James M. Ludlow,	City of East Orange, East Orange.
George J. McEwan,	City of Jersey City, Jersey City.
Rev. H. W. McGuire,	City of Bayonne, Bayonne.
Joseph McManus,	Board of Trade, Elizabeth.
E. Mackey,	Public Schools, Trenton.
Prof. Allan Marquand,	Princeton University, Princeton.
Henry M. Maxson,	Board of Education, Plainfield.
Mrs. John L. Meeker,	State Federation Women's Clubs, Newark.
A. B. Meredith,	State of New Jersey, Essex County Depart- ment Public Instruction, Nutley.
Mrs. A. B. Meredith,	State of New Jersey, Essex County Depart- ment Public Instruction, Nutley.

- Agnes Miller,
 William George Nelson,
 Rev. A. C. Nickerson,
 Hon. Thomas Oakes,
 Otto Ortel,
 Mrs. John R. Paddock,
 Juliet Stuart Points,
 Rev. Horace Porter,
 H. G. Prout,
 Rev. F. B. Reazor,
 A. Riesenberger,
 Mrs. Alfred B. Robinson,
 Rev. Julian Scholl,
 Charlotte Schetter,
 Mrs. Theodore F. Seward,
 Rev. J. Franklin Shindell,
 E. D. Smith,
 Elias D. Smith,
 Dr. Sara C. Spottiswood,
 Rev. J. D. Steele,
 Mrs. George Sturck,
 Rabbi Nathan Stern,
 Dr. H. S. Stewart,
 Rev. S. M. Studdiford,
 Edward K. Sumerwell,
 Mrs. Edward K. Sumerwell,
 Rev. J. M. Surtees,
 William P. Sutphen,
 G. E. Terwilliger,
 Rev. W. M. Trumbower,
 W. von Voigtlander,
 F. C. Van Dyck,
 Rev. F. Hawley Van Eps,
 Mrs. Mary Gregory Webb,
 Rev. Edgar S. Weirs,
 Mrs. Anna C. Westheimer,
 William A. Wetzel,
 Mrs. William A. Wetzel,
 Robert E. Willis,
 Mary Willets,
 O. I. Woodley,
 Benjamin C. Wooster,
 Mrs. Frank J. Woulfe,
 David Henry Wright,
 Mrs. David Henry Wright,
 Pheobe C. Wright,
 Orange Political Study Club, Orange.
 City of Jersey City, Jersey City.
 First Unitarian Society, Plainfield.
 Board of Education, Bloomfield.
 New Jersey Educational Association, Union.
 Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Orange.
 Barnard College, Jersey City Heights.
 Congregational Church, Montclair.
 Chamber of Commerce, Nutley.
 St. Mark's Parish, West Orange.
 Stevens Institute, Hoboken.
 Woman's Club of Upper Montclair, Montclair.
 First Church of Christ, Scientist, Jersey City.
 Women's Natl. Single Tax League, Orange.
 National Society of New England Women,
 East Orange.
 First Baptist Church, Highwood Park.
 Board of Trade, Elizabeth.
 Board of Trade, Elizabeth.
 Woman's Club, Orange.
 First Presbyterian Church, Passaic.
 New Jersey Society Daughters American Revolution, Jersey City.
 City of Trenton, Trenton.
 Calvary Baptist Church, Hackensack.
 City of Trenton, Trenton.
 State Civic Federation, East Orange.
 State Civic Federation, East Orange.
 Manasquan Civic League, Atlantic City.
 City of Bloomfield, Bloomfield.
 Stevens Institute, Hoboken.
 M. E. Church, Bayonne.
 Stevens Institute, Hoboken.
 Taxpayers' Ass'n of N. J., Paterson.
 Grace Presbyterian Church, Passaic.
 Women's Club, Glen Ridge.
 Unity Church, Montclair.
 Bayonne Political Study Club, Bayonne.
 Trenton High School, Trenton.
 Trenton High School, Trenton.
 Stevens Institute, Elizabeth.
 Friends' Meeting of Shrewsbury, Seagirt.
 State Educational Board, Passaic.
 Educational Society of N. J., Hackensack.
 Decatur Woman's Club, East Orange.
 Universal Peace Union, Riverton.
 Universal Peace Union, Riverton.
 Friends' Meeting of Shrewsbury, Shrewsbury.

Mrs. Charles B. Yardley, Essex Chapter Daughters American Revolution, East Orange.

Mrs. D. M. Davidson, Women's Club, Rutherford.

NEW MEXICO.

L. Bradford Prince, Santa Fe Board of Trade.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Mary Bridgers, First Church of Christ, Scientist, Wilmington.
F. H. Busbee, State of North Carolina, Raleigh.

Mrs. Hayne Davis, Gen. Robert F. Hoke Chapter, United Daughters of Confederacy, Salisbury.

Franklin S. Blair, State of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Mrs. Ella Weill, First Church of Christ, Scientist, Wilmington.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Hon. N. J. Bachelder, The National Grange, East Andover.

Rev. T. Chalmers, D.D., First Congregational Church, Manchester.

James F. Colby, Delegate at Large, Hanover.

Herbert D. Foster, State of New Hampshire, Hanover.

Charles Osborne, Friends Sabbath School, North Wear.

NEW YORK.

Captain James M. Andrews, City of Saratoga Springs, Saratoga Springs.

Dr. A. Aaron, Temple Beth Zue, Buffalo.

T. H. Bane, Military Academy, West Point.

Geoffrey Bartlett, Military Academy, West Point.

Lina Beard, Good Citizenship League, Flushing.

Prof. T. C. Bracy, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie.

William Brodie, Dutch Reform, Steinway, L. I.

Grace M. Brown, Shaker Society, Mt. Lebanon.

A. W. Brown, St. Mark's M. E. Church, Prince's Bay.

Mary J. Browne, Natl. Council Queen's Daughters, Yonkers.

George C. Buell, City of Rochester, Rochester.

T. Romeyn Bunn, First Church of Christ, Scientist, Amsterdam.

Sarah Burger, Shaker Society, Mt. Lebanon.

Francis M. Carpenter, State Legislature of New York, Mt. Kisco.

Miss C. A. Childs, Jacob A. Riis Settlement, Great Neck, L. I.

Rev. Charles L. Clist, Plattekill Reform Church, Mt. Marion.

H. T. Clough, The Shaker Community, Mt. Lebanon.

Rev. Chas. M. Collins, Reformed Church, Steinway, L. I.

Ver Planck Colvin, City of Albany, Albany.

Mrs. Margaret R. Cox, First Church of Christ, Scientist, Albany.

Aurelia Crane, St. James the Less, Scarsdale.

Fred T. Cruse, Military Academy, West Point.

Andrew C. Davis, City of Cohoes, Cohoes.

Mrs. John Dayton, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Bay-side.

Rev. Amanda Deyo, Universal Peace Union, Mount Lebanon.

- William A. Douglas,
 Col. E. S. Dudley,
 Prof. Allen M. Dulles,
 Jacob W. Clute,
 Clyde L. Eastman,
 Rev. J. R. Ellis,
 Miss L. C. Elles,
 Irving Elting,
 Mrs. M. H. Elwell,
 Mrs. C. A. G. Fairchild,
 George M. Forbes,
 John T. Freeman,
 Robert G. Freeman,
 Mrs. Alice V. Frost,
 George Gearn,
 Rev. Elmer D. Gildersleeve,
 J. Fred Goehren,
 C. E. Goodrich,
 William W. A. Gracey,
 H. B. Graves,
 Mrs. Phoebe W. Griffin,
 Dr. Joseph H. Gunning,
 Prof. E. E. Hale, Jr.,
 Charles T. Harris, Jr.,
 S. B. Hershey,
 Merwin K. Hart,
 W. D. Hildush,
 Prof. F. S. Hoffman,
 John A. Holaburd,
 Charles Holtzmann,
 Dr. James Clayton Howard,
 Emily Howland,
 W. H. Hubbard,
 William B. Jones,
 Mrs. William B. Jones,
 Peter F. Keefe,
 Rev. R. J. Keefe,
 John W. Lang,
 Rev. H. O. Ladd,
 Rev. W. Laidlow,
 Max Landsberg,
 Mrs. Max Landsberg,
 W. T. Langdon, Jr.,
 City of Buffalo, Buffalo.
 Military Academy, West Point.
 Auburn Business Men's Association, Auburn.
 City of Schenectady, Schenectady.
 Military Academy, West Point.
 City of Cohoes, Cohoes.
 Queens-Nassau Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Flushing.
 City of Poughkeepsie, Poughkeepsie.
 Schenectady Women's Club, Schenectady.
 N. Y. State, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Montgomery.
 University of Rochester, Rochester.
 City of Schenectady, Schenectady.
 Mayor of Buffalo, Buffalo.
 Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Richmond Hill.
 Newburgh Free Academy, Newburgh.
 Religious Society of Friends, Poughkeepsie.
 Spring St. Presbyterian Church, Mt. Vernon.
 The Moravian Church, Great Kills.
 Political Equality Club, Geneva.
 Board of Commerce, Rochester.
 Queens-Nassau Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Whitestone.
 St. James the Less, Scarsdale.
 Union College, Schenectady.
 Military Academy, West Point.
 Chamber of Commerce, Rochester.
 City of Utica, Utica.
 Union College, Schenectady.
 Union College, Schenectady.
 Military Academy, West Point.
 City of Schenectady, Schenectady.
 Kingsley Parish, Stapleton.
 Universal Peace Union, Sherwood.
 Business Men's Association, Auburn.
 Albany Chamber of Commerce, Albany.
 Albany Academy for Girls, Albany.
 Order of Railway Conductors, Rochester.
 St. John's Roman Catholic Church, White Plains.
 Military Academy, West Point.
 Grace Church, Jamaica.
 Federation of Churches, Tarrytown.
 City of Rochester, Rochester.
 Congregation Berith Kodesh, Rochester.
 Beekman Hill Meth. Church, Beekman Hill.

- Robert Lansing,
Col. C. W. Larnier,
Dr. Albert G. Lawson,
Rev. H. Lilienthal,
Rev. George R. Lunn,
Rev. J. E. Lyall,
William McCabe,
F. H. McKenzie,
Countess Spottiswood
Mackin,
George B. Massey,
C. L. Mead,
Ann Fitzhugh Miller,
Elizabeth Smith Miller,
Thomas Murphy,
Maxwell Murray,
Emma J. Neale,
Mrs. C. A. Nearing,
- Mrs. Wm. I. Onderdonk,
John W. Paris,
Rev. John S. Penman,
Harry Pfeil,
Kate Putnam,
Mrs. Milton Rathbun,
Pres. A. V. V. Raymond,
Rt. Rev. J. L. Reilly,
Rev. J. B. J. Rhoades,
F. W. Richardson,
Daniel Offord,
Rev. W. M. Richardson,
George C. Richmond,
Rev. Dr. Chas. E. Robinson,
Hon. Wm. Cary Sanger,
Rev. L. R. Schuyler,
Mrs. L. R. Schuyler,
Col. U. S. Scott,
Mrs. Ida M. Sherman,
Daniel Smiley,
- Prof. Earl E. Sperry,
Carleton Sprague,
Mrs. C. A. Sproat,
Mrs. E. C. F. Stephens,
Lindley H. Stevens,
Mrs. L. C. Stewardson,
Augusta Stone,
Frederick E. Storke,
- City of Watertown, Watertown.
Military Academy, West Point.
Colgate University, Hamilton.
St. George's Church, Astoria.
City of Schenectady, Schenectady.
Millbrook Reformed Church, South Millbrook.
Cigar Makers' International Union, Albany.
Reformed Church, Flushing.
Nat. Society Queen's Daughters of Heaven,
Yonkers.
City of Watertown, Watertown.
Union College, Schenectady.
Political Equality Club, Geneva.
Political Equality Club, Geneva.
City of Buffalo, Buffalo.
Military Academy, West Point.
Shaker Society, Mt. Lebanon.
Woman's Christian Temperance Union, One-
onta.
Indian Association, White Plains.
Business Men's Association, Flushing.
City of Poughkeepsie, Poughkeepsie.
Military Academy, West Point.
City of Buffalo, Buffalo.
Political Equality League, Port Washington.
Union College, Schenectady.
City of Schenectady, Schenectady.
St. Mark's M. E. Church, Prince's Bay.
City of Auburn, Auburn.
Shaker Society, Mt. Lebanon.
Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, Pocantico Hill.
St. George Episcopal Church, Rochester.
Brooklyn Public Library, Pelham Manor.
The American Nat'l Red Cross, Sangerfield.
United Daughters of Confederacy, Scarsdale.
United Daughters of Confederacy, Scarsdale.
Military Academy, West Point.
First Church of Christ, Scientist, Oswego.
Lake Mohonk Arbitration Conference, Lake
Mohonk.
Syracuse University, Syracuse.
Chamber of Commerce, Buffalo.
Political Equality Club, Valley Falls.
Monthly Society of Friends, Poughkeepsie.
Monthly Society of Friends, Poughkeepsie.
Political Equality Club, Geneva.
Shaker Society, Mt. Lebanon.
City of Auburn, Auburn.

Mrs. E. D. Stringham,
 Henry H. Swift,
 Mrs. Mary G. Swift,
 Rebecca F. Talman,
 Col. S. E. Tillman,
 Willard O. Trueblood,
 Rev. F. B. Van Kleeck,
 Lewis H. Watkins,
 Miss L. C. Watson,
 Lansing G. Wetmore,
 Hon. John S. Whalen,
 Charles L. Willert,
 Mrs. Martha C. Willets,

Col. E. E. Wood.

Rev. G. C. Yersley,

Universal Peace Union, Glencove, L. I.
 N. Y. Yearly Meeting of Friends, Millbrook.
 N. Y. Yearly Meeting of Friends, Millbrook.
 Political Equality Club, Geneva.
 Military Academy, West Point.
 Friends Church, Poughkeepsie.
 City of White Plains, White Plains.
 Military Academy, West Point.
 City of Utica, Utica.
 Chamber of Commerce, Rochester.
 Secretary of State, Albany.
 City of Buffalo, Buffalo.
 Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Purchase.
 Military Academy, West Point.
 First Presbyterian Church, Hudson.

NEW YORK CITY.

Mrs. Robert Abbe,
 Miss E. M. Abrams,
 Elbridge L. Adams,
 May V. Adams,
 Dr. John L. Adams,
 W. M. Aiken,
 W. M. Aikman,
 Rev. J. W. Alexander,
 Rev. John S. Allen,
 Mrs. Louis H. Allen,
 Sadie American,
 John A. Amory,
 Margaret Anderson,
 Rev. Wm. F. Anderson,
 Miss G. K. B. Andrews,
 Mrs. Helen J. Andrews,

George E. Armstrong,
 Fred W. Atkinson,
 Benjamin M. Asch,
 Grosvenor Atterbury,
 Jeanette Baird,
 Dr. Sara Josephine Baker,
 Miss G. B. Ballard,
 John Bambay,
 Miss J. F. Bangs,
 Moulvi M. Barakatullah,
 Mrs. John O. Barnes,
 S. J. Barrows,
 Rev. A. E. Barnett,

City History Club.
 The Association of Neighborhood Workers.
 City Club.
 Goulding News Syndicate.
 New York School of Chemical Medicine.
 American Institute of Architects.
 Westminster Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn.
 St. Mark's M. E. Church.
 The Marble Collegiate Church.
 Vassar Students Aid Society, N. Y. Branch.
 Council of Jewish Women.
 North Side Board of Trade.
 Nurses' Settlement.
 Board of Education of M. E. Church.
 Women's Philharmonic Society.
 New York County Woman's Christian Temperance Union.
 The Merchants' Association of New York.
 Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn.
 Cigar Packers' Union.
 The American Institute of Architects.
 Portia Club.
 College Woman's Club.
 Young Woman's Christian Association.
 North Side Board of Trade.
 Young Woman's Christian Association.
 Pan-Aryan Association.
 Colonial Chapter Daughters of the Revolution.
 Inter-Parliamentary Union.
 Tremont M. E. Church.

Eleanor Bartell,	Normal College.
Rev. Miner Lee Bates,	First Church of Disciples.
Rev. Charles P. Baylis,	Church of the Open Door.
Deaconess Beard,	Church of San Salvatore.
David Belais,	New York City Humane Society.
Mrs. Clark Bell,	Sorosis.
Mrs. R. A. Benedict,	The Women's Peace Circle.
Mrs. Minnie Bemecker,	Normal College Settlement.
W. M. H. Birchall,	North Side Board of Trade.
Lillie Devereux Blake,	New York Legislative League.
Mrs. Harriot S. Blatch,	Equality League of Self-Supporting Women.
David Blaustein,	The Educational Alliance.
R. A. Theodora Bliss,	Delegate at Large.
Dr. A. M. Blossom,	New Century Study Circle.
Rev. Edward Blews,	16th St. Free Methodist Church.
Rev. A. Blum,	Jewish Ministers' Association.
Mr. Blumenson,	University Settlement.
William H. Blymyer,	Universal Peace Union.
Annette Boardman,	Chinatown Bowery Rescue Settlement.
Prof. M. T. Bogert,	American Chemical Society.
O. N. W. Bohen,	State of New York.
George C. Boldt,	American National Red Cross.
Rev. H. Arthur Booker,	St. Paul's Baptist Church.
C. L. Bordman,	D. Y. N. T. House.
John H. Boschen,	Young Men's Christian Association.
Mrs. Kate M. Bostwick,	Original Women's Republican Club.
Mrs. Louis Boynton,	Society for Political Study.
Mrs. P. S. Boynton,	Women's Republican Club.
Louis C. Bradshaw,	Young Men's Christian Association.
F. C. Breed,	Union Theological Seminary.
Mrs. L. C. Brackett,	Washington Headquarters Association.
Mrs. Walter S. Brewster,	Brooklyn Heights Seminary Club.
Josiah A. Briggs,	North Side Board of Trade.
Mrs. H. M. Brigham,	Photereone Club, Brooklyn.
Rev. William H. Brooks,	St. Mark's Methodist Episcopal Church.
P. E. Brotherson,	S. D. A. Church, Brooklyn.
F. Brown,	Union Theological Seminary.
Mrs. William G. Brown,	West End Women's Republican Association.
Rev. Wm. M. Brundage,	Third Unitarian Church, Brooklyn.
Mrs. Rose L. Brunner,	Political Equality League.
Dr. George W. Brush,	The Medal of Honor Legion of United States.
Mrs. Ernest Bunzl,	Women's Republican Club.
Mrs. Clarence Burns,	Little Mothers' Aid Association.
Rev. Joseph D. Burrell,	Classon Avenue Presbyterian Church.
Bailey Burritt,	Speyer School.
Dr. Joseph Byrn,	The League of Peace.
Clara Byrnes,	Normal College.
Elton Cacceani,	Nuovo Giornali.

- James P. Cohen,
 Mrs. James P. Cohen,
 Julius P. Cohen,
 Mrs. Julius P. Cohen,
 Mrs. Mildred M. Caldwell,
 Dr. Elizabeth Cameron,
 Mrs. E. P. Campbell,
 Anthony Campagne,
 William J. Campbell,
 Thomas F. Carney,
 Mrs. Philip Carpenter,
 Mrs. H. B. Carroll,
 Rev. William Carter,
 Mrs. Robert F. Cartwright,
 Herbert L. Casson,
 Mrs. Carrie Chapman-Catt,
 Charles S. Catlin,
 J. Lyons Caughey,
 Rev. James V. Chalmers,
 Mrs. N. R. Chambliss,
 Henry Chancellor,
 F. R. Chandler,
 Valentine L. Chandor,
 Mrs. A. C. Chenoweth,
 M. Christenson,
 Mrs. Kate L. Chrystal,
 Mrs. Frank B. Church,
 Rev. John Lewis Clark,
 Mrs. L. A. Clark,
 Walter E. Clark,
 Joseph Culbertson Clayton,
 Prof. John U. Cleary,
 Rev. Dr. Clendenin,
 Mrs. Clendenin,
 Fred C. Cocheu,
 Mrs. Herbert Cohn,
 Sarah W. Collins,
 Mrs. L. R. Commander,
 F. J. Conrade,
 Dr. Moncure V. Conway,
 James E. Cowles,
 Clarence F. Corner,
 Mrs. Walter W. Court,
 Rev. Sydney Herbert Cox,
 Ida A. Craft,
 New York School of Clinical Medicine.
 New York City Mother's Club.
 New York School of Clinical Medicine.
 New York City Mothers' Club.
 National Society of Ohio Women.
 Brooklyn Public Library Association.
 International Sunshine Society, Brooklyn.
 Church of San Salvatore.
 West Presbyterian Church.
 Retail Furniture and Carpet Salesmen's Union.
 General Federation of Women's Clubs.
 Society for Political Study.
 Madison Avenue Reformed Church.
 Minewa Literary Club.
 New York City Humane Society.
 National American Woman Suffrage Ass'n.
 Second Unitarian Society, Brooklyn.
 Harlem Presbyterian Church.
 Church of Holy Trinity.
 Stonewall Jackson Chapter, United Daughters
 of Gonfederacy.
 Federation of Church Clubs.
 Chicago Real Estate Board.
 Woman's University Club.
 Daughters of Holland Dames.
 Swedish Peace Society.
 Professional Woman's League.
 Mary Arden Shakespeare Club.
 Bushwick Congregational Church.
 Woman's Christian Temperance Union of
 Oswego, Brooklyn.
 College of the City of New York.
 "The American Lawyer."
 Fordham University.
 St. Peter's Church.
 St. Peter's Church Societies.
 Manufacturers' Association of New York.
 College of the City of New York.
 Westchester County Woman's Christian Tem-
 perance Union.
 Equality League of Self-Supporting Women.
 Health Culture Club.
 Dickinson College.
 Postal Progress League.
 Summerfield M. E. Church and Bible Club.
 Original Women's Rep. Club, Brooklyn.
 Bethany Congregation.
 Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Mrs. Chas. O. H. Craigie,
 Mrs. Fred Crane,
 J. S. Dalley,
 Rabbi David Davidson,
 Gertrude Day,
 Mrs. Mary I. DeGross,
 Mrs. W. G. Demerest,
 Rev. John B. Devins,
 Rev. H. P. Dewey,
 Walter T. Diack,

William D. Dickey,
 William J. Dilthey,
 Samuel J. Dike,
 Prof. Edward T. Divine,
 Cleveland H. Dodge,
 Miss E. Doheny,
 Rev. G. Donaldson,
 Marion B. Doolittle,
 Anna Doughty,
 William Harris Douglas,
 Theodore F. Douglass,
 Miss M. F. Doyen,
 Julia H. Doyle,
 Mrs. William K. Draper,
 Mary E. Dreier,
 Stephen D. Duggan,
 Mrs. Charles Duggin,
 Victor H. Duras,
 Rev. Caleb S. S. Dutton,
 George L. Duval,
 Mrs. G. W. Eastburn,
 Viola Eckstein,
 Mrs. B. Elling,
 Brother Edward,
 Andrew W. Edson,
 Rabbi Aaron Eiseman,
 Lou Elwell,
 Herman Epstein,
 Rev. A. H. Evans,
 Rev. John G. Fagg,
 C. P. Fagnani,
 Harvey M. Ferris,
 H. Falvey,
 Arthur B. Farquhar,
 J. A. Farrell,
 P. F. Farrell,

Brooklyn Public Library Association.
 Consumers' League of City of New York.
 Church of Jesus Christ, Latter Day Saints.
 Congregational Agndath Jeshorin.
 College Settlement.
 First Church of Christ, Scientist, S. I.
 Society for Political Study.
 Presbyterian Church of New York.
 Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn.
 West Side Branch Young Men's Christian
 Association.
 Maritime Association of Port of New York.
 Calvary English Lutheran Church.
 First Moravian Church.
 American Academy Political & Social Science.
 American National Red Cross.
 Young Woman's Christian Association.
 Delegate at Large.
 Greenport Settlement, Brooklyn.
 Mary Arden Shakespeare Club.
 New York Produce Exchange.
 Typographical Union.
 Asacog Settlement.
 Evening School No. 67.
 American National Red Cross.
 Women's Trade Union League, Brooklyn.
 College of the City of New York.
 Church of New Jerusalem.
 Bohemian Literary Society.
 Second Unitarian Society, Brooklyn.
 Merchants' Association of New York.
 Long Acre League.
 Clara De Hirsch Home for Working Girls.
 Rutgers League.
 Manhattan College.
 Delegate at Large.
 72d Street Synagogue.
 Business Women's League.
 People's Institute Club.
 West Presbyterian Church.
 Middle Collegiate Church.
 New York Peace Society.
 First Church of Christ, Scientist, Brooklyn.
 American Brotherhood of Cement Workers.
 National Association of Manufacturers.
 College of the City of New York.
 The International Association of Bridge and
 Structural Iron Workers.

Amy Fay,
 Henry Feldman,
 J. G. D. Ferguson,
 Mrs. S. J. Fischer,
 Dr. Edward Fisher,
 Rev. M. J. Flynn,
 Otto G. Foelker,
 J. M. Ford,
 Mrs. L. Fort,
 Edith W. Fosdick,
 J. N. Francolini,
 Mrs. A. E. Fraser,
 Rev. Chas. E. Furman,
 Mrs. Nellie E. C. Furmen,
 Michael Furst,
 Mrs. Royal W. Gage,
 Elizabeth Gaines,
 Eleanor Gay,
 James Gear,
 Edward G. Gerstle,
 William H. Gibson,
 Franklin H. Giddings,
 Mrs. Alice W. Gifford,
 Mrs. Nathan Glauber,
 Mrs. Eleanor B. Glogan,
 Rev. Israel Goldfarb,
 Henry M. Goldfogle,
 I. E. Goldwasser,
 David Golieb,
 Mrs. Marion Goldman,
 Mrs. Chas. Goldsborough,

 Mrs. Mary H. Gomes,
 Mrs. J. R. Gomez,
 Gen. J. Adelphi Gottlieb,
 Mrs. E. Grannis,
 Prof. Charles A. Green,
 Charles A. Green,
 Elizabeth W. Greenwood,

 Rev. David B. Griffiths,
 Mrs. R. Grossman,
 Rev. Dr. R. Grossman,
 S. M. Guerin,
 Mrs. J. R. Guernsey,
 Mrs. Louis Guttman,
 Helen M. Hall,
 James H. Hamilton,

Women's Philharmonic Society.
 German-American Peace Society.
 The Union Settlement.
 Young Women's Christian Association.
 Medical Association for Prevention of War.
 Federation Societies of South Brooklyn.
 State Legislature of New York, Brooklyn.
 Church of Jesus Christ, Latter Day Saints.
 Business Women's League.
 Normal College Alumni House.
 Italian Chamber of Commerce.
 Women's Health Protective Ass'n, Brooklyn.
 Church of the Open Door, Brooklyn.
 International Sunshine Society, Brooklyn.
 Temple Israel of Brooklyn.
 Chiorean Club, Brooklyn.
 Adelphi College, Brooklyn.
 Barnard College.
 Church of Epiphany.
 Emanuel Brotherhood.
 Board of Trade and Transportation.
 New York Peace Society.
 Rainy Day Club.
 Council of Jewish Women.
 Portia Club.
 Congregation Beth Israel, Brooklyn.
 Legislative Committee.
 Sunday School Teachers' Association.
 Hartley House.
 Recreation Rooms and Settlement.
 New York Chapter United Daughters of
 Confederacy.
 Brooklyn Women's Suffrage Ass'n, Brooklyn.
 Happy Hour Club.
 National Vol. Emergency Service Med. Corps.
 National League for the Promotion of Purity.
 Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn.
 American Seamen's Friend Society.
 Woman's Christian Temperance Union of
 Brooklyn.
 Edgehill Church, Spuyten Duyvil.
 Temple Rodeph Sholom.
 New York Board of Jewish Ministers.
 United Brothers of Carpenters.
 Young Woman's Christian Association.
 Vassar Student's Aid Society.
 Riverside Association.
 University Settlement.

Mrs. Edward P. Hampson,	Women's Suffrage Association, Brooklyn.
Alice Fisher Harcourt,	The Twelfth Night Club.
Rev. Frank P. Harris.	M. E. Church, 44th Street.
M. H. Harris,	Temple Israel.
Mrs. Maurice Harris,	Temple Israel Sisterhood .
Richard Hartley,	Hope Baptist Church.
Mrs. Richard Hartley,	Hope Baptist Church.
Siegfried Hartman,	College of the City of New York.
Rev. L. A. Harvey,	Fourth Unitarian Church.
Mrs. L. A. Harvey,	Fourth Unitarian Church.
Mrs. Harry Hastings,	Women's Peace Circle.
Edwin F. Hatfield,	First Church of Christ, Scientist.
F. Hauschild,	First German M. E. Church.
Mary G. Hay,	Women's Press Club.
Daniel P. Hays,	Temple Israel of Harlem.
Mrs. Daniel P. Hays,	Local School Board of 19th District.
Mrs. Henry M. Heath,	Kosmos Club, Brooklyn.
Rev. H. H. Heck,	First German M. E. Church.
J. Heinsoth,	Young Men's Christian Association.
Mrs. Frances Hellman,	Women's Conference Ethical Culture Society.
Mrs. A. B. Hepburn,	City History Club.
Dr. Hervey,	Delegate at Large.
Rev. St. Clair Hester,	Church of the Messiah, Brooklyn.
Rev. W. H. Hethrick,	Calvary English Lutheran Church, Brooklyn.
Hon. Warren Higley,	National Society Sons American Revolution.
Mrs. Warren J. Higley,	Woman's Press Club.
Matthew Hinman,	Order of Founders and Patriots of America.
Mrs. Bella Hirsch,	Society of Ethical Culture.
Prof. Frederick Hirth,	Delegate at Large.
P. L. Hoen,	Seventh Day Adventist, Brooklyn.
William B. Hogan,	Speyer School.
August Holbermann,	Peace and Harmony Com. of One Hundred.
Mrs. Cornelia A. Hollub,	Women's Peace Circle.
Dr. Holm,	Business Women's League.
Rev. John Haynes Holmes,	Church of Messiah, Unitarian.
Mrs. Franklin W. Hooper,	Unity Church, Brooklyn.
Mrs. Dunlap Hopkins,	School of Applied Design.
Rev. H. M. Hopkins,	Church of the Holy Nativity.
Mrs. Wm. H. Hotchkin,	Colonial Chapter Daughters of the Revolution.
Mrs. Louis S. Houghton,	Woman's Christian Temperance Union.
Lolabell House,	Park Side Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn.
Mrs. George Howes,	Rutgers League.
Nellie L. Howes,	Professional Women's League.
Mrs. Isaac Howland,	Women's Health Protective Association.
Eva M. Hubbard,	Rutgers League.
William N. Hubbell,	Judson Memorial Church.
Charles Hulihan,	Pattern Makers' League, N. A.

Rev. H. S. Hull,
 Rev. W. B. Humphrey,
 Mrs. M. E. I. Humphrey,
 Rev. G. McP. Hunter,
 J. W. Hutchinson,
 Miss Irwin,
 Anna M. Jackson,
 George M. Jackson,
 A. Jacobi,
 F. L. Janewey,
 George H. Janeway,
 George W. Johnson,
 Robert U. Johnson,
 Mrs. J. H. Johnston,
 Mrs. Francis B. Jones,
 Mrs. R. W. Jones,

S. L. Joshi,
 George Kahut,
 Jacob Kenzler,
 Fred W. Keasley,
 Garry Kelly,

Mrs. Clara C. Kennedy,
 Rev. W. H. Keplian,
 Frank Kevlin,
 Mrs. Mary S. Kimber,
 Rev. A. Arthur King,
 Mrs. A. Arthur King
 Mrs. Francis Kinnicutt,
 Dr. S. A. Knopf,
 Mrs. C. C. Knowlton,
 R. C. King,
 Rabbi Mayer Kopstein,
 Rev. M. Kranskopf,
 Mrs. Samuel Kubie,
 Hermann C. Kudlick,
 Nathaniel Laird,
 Charles W. Lawrence,

Mrs. Chas. W. Lawrence,
 Dr. A. G. Lawson,
 P. T. Lazarus,
 Dr. A. L. Ledoux,
 A. Lenalie,
 Nathaniel H. Levi,
 Mrs. Arthur S. Levy,
 Ivey W. Lewis,

Grace M. P. Church.
 Mayflower Society of New York.
 Mayflower Society of New York.
 American Seamen's Friend Society.
 Society of Friends.
 Gospel Settlement League.
 Religious Society of Friends.
 Typographical Union.
 American Medical Association.
 Union Theological Seminary.
 New York Produce Exchange.
 Federation of Churches, Brooklyn.
 Century Magazine.
 The Little Mothers' Aid Association.
 Washington Headquarters Association.
 New York Chapter United Daughters of
 Confederacy.
 Pan-Aryan Association.
 Society for Religious Culture.
 Columbia University.
 "The American Lawyer."
 Int. Ass'n of Bridge and Structural Iron
 Workers.
 Rutgers Alumni Association.
 North Side Board of Trade.
 Greenwich House Settlement.
 Indian Association.
 Emanuel Lutheran Church.
 Emanuel Lutheran Church.
 Barnard College.
 Church of Messiah.
 New York League of Unitarian Women.
 Union Theological Seminary.
 Temple Adath Israel.
 Atereth Israel.
 Council of Jewish Women.
 German-American Peace Society.
 St. Nicholas Presbyterian Church.
 New York Monthly Meeting Religious Society
 of Friends.
 Friends' Christian Endeavor Society.
 Judson Memorial Church.
 Retail Furniture and Carpet Salesmen's Union.
 American Institute of Mining Engineers.
 People's Symphony Concerts.
 Broadway Board of Trade, Brooklyn.
 National Jewish Women's Council.
 Plymouth Church, Brooklyn.

Rev. F. A. Licht,	First German Baptist Church.
E. M. Lindley,	League of American Pen Women.
Rev. Stephen A. Lloyd,	Church of the Evangel, Brooklyn.
Rev. John D. Long,	Park Side Church, Brooklyn.
Edward H. Loud,	Maritime Exchange, Brooklyn.
C. E. Lounsbery,	Women's Health Protective Ass'n, Flatbush.
Rev. Edward Loux,	Madison Avenue Baptist Church.
Mrs. Edward Loux,	Madison Avenue Baptist Church.
Rev. R. D. Lord,	Inter-Church Conference, Brooklyn.
Mrs. J. de la M. Lozier,	Rutgers Female College and Inst., Brooklyn.
Rev. Henry Lubeck,	Zion and St. Timothy Church.
M. W. Ludden,	Gospel Settlement League.
Mrs. Frank M. Lupton,	Kosmos Club, Brooklyn.
Emma Lutzius,	Normal College.
James M. Lynch,	International Typographical Union.
Julia G. McAllister,	Colonial Dames of America.
Silas McBee,	"The Churchman."
John F. McCabe,	Typographical Union.
William McCarroll,	N. Y. Board of Trade and Transportation.
John J. McCook,	New York Peace Society.
Miss McClure,	West Side Neighborhood House.
N. H. McCord,	The Merchants' Association of New York.
J. Crawford McCreery,	The Merchants' Association of New York.
Sarah W. McDannold,	Women's Press Club.
Walter McDougall,	Bedford Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn.
Mrs. Harriet C. McDowell,	Young Friends' Association.
William O. McDowell,	The League of Peace.
Mrs. C. M. McEvoy,	Young Woman's Christian Association.
Rev. W. H. McGlanflin,	Church of Eternal Hope.
Rev. Wallace MacMullen,	Madison Avenue M. E. Church.
Mrs. Wallace MacMullen,	Madison Avenue M. E. Church.
Lieut. Collin A. McLeod,	National Vol. Emergency Service Med. Corps.
Mrs. John S. McKay,	Women's Club, Brooklyn.
Mrs. Alex. McNaughton,	Knickerbocker Relief Club.
Mrs. Howard McNutt,	Minerva Literary Club, Brooklyn.
Henry M. MacCracken,	New York University.
Edward H. Magill,	Universal Peace Union.
Mrs. Edward H. Magill,	Universal Peace Union.
N. P. Nahon,	Amalgamated Carpenters.
Mrs. William R. Malone,	National Society of Ohio Women.
M. Mandl,	Immigration Society—France.
William A. Marble,	The Merchants Association of New York.
Egisto Mariani,	Italian Chamber of Commerce.
Harry Markowitz,	College Settlement.
Helen Marot,	Women's Trade Union League.
Mrs. Emilee S. Martin,	National Women's Press Club.
John C. Martin,	J. C. Martin Educational Fund.
Ellen S. Marvin,	The Union Settlement.

C. C. Mathews,
 Dr. Bertha Lubertz,
 Mrs. James Matthews,
 Charles M. Maxwell,
 Rev. B. Mehrkens,
 Mansfield Merriman,
 Henry Metzner,
 Rev. M. A. Meyer,
 Theodore Meyer,
 Mrs. H. Meyers,
 Rev. I. B. Michaelson,
 J. de la Montague,
 Samuel Morris,
 Dr. W. James Morton,
 Levi P. Morton,
 Frank Moss,

James J. Murphy,
 William Nason,
 Mrs. Simeon H. Newhouse
 Marguerite Newland,
 Augustus S. Newman,
 Mrs. Benjamin Niccol,
 Ludwig Nissen,
 Mrs. John L. Niver,
 Mrs. Louis Nixon,
 Miss I. Nordlinger,
 Delle Fay Norris,
 Thomas O'Brien,
 P. J. O'Connell,
 E. E. Olcott,
 Mrs. Henry Ollesheimer,
 Mrs. Frank S. Osborn,
 Mrs. Homer I. Ostrom,
 Rev. W. F. Ottarson,
 George H. Owen,
 Thomas Paine,

Erastus Palmer,
 Mrs. James H. Parker,

Mrs. Harry Parsons,
 Henry E. Payne,
 Rev. W. J. Peck,
 Hedley Pedlar,
 Edward W. Peet,
 Rev. D. L. Pelton,
 Rev. I. de la Penha,

Pilgrim Church.
 Chrystie Street Settlement Rooms.
 Original Women's Rep. Club, Brooklyn.
 Typographical Union.
 Emanuel Lutheran Church.
 Lehigh University.
 North American Gymnastic Union.
 Temple Israel, Brooklyn.
 German-American Peace Society.
 Council of Jewish Women.
 Banai Sholaum, Brooklyn.
 National Society Sons American Revolution.
 Henry Street Settlement.
 Medical Assn. for Prevention of War.
 Chamber of Commerce.
 Natl. Christian League for the Promotion of
 Purity.
 Typographical Union.
 Marble Cutters' Association.
 Mary Arden Shakespeare Club.
 Barnard College.
 Young Men's Christian Association.
 Consumers' League of New York.
 Board of Trade and Transportation, Brooklyn.
 Century Theatre Club.
 Daughters American Revolution.
 The Portia Club.
 N. Y. City Vassar Students' Aid Society.
 Nurses Settlement.
 Typographical Union No. 6.
 American Institute of Mining Engineers.
 N. Y. Association of Working Girls.
 Century Theatre Club.
 Sorosis.
 New York Presbytery.
 The Navy League of the United States.
 Pilgrim Congregational Church, Richmond
 Hill.
 College of the City of New York.
 N. Y. Chapter United Daughters of the Con-
 federacy.
 International Children's School Farm League.
 Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn.
 Union Church, Corona, L. I.
 16th Street Methodist Church, Brooklyn.
 Broadway Tabernacle Church.
 St. James Episcopal Church.
 Spanish and Portugese Congregation.

Mary J. Pierson,
 Josephene Pomerene,
 Mrs. William H. Porter,
 Brother Potamian,
 Emma T. Pretlow,
 Robert E. Pretlow,
 Leopold Prince,
 Ruth Price,
 Dr. Henry S. Pritchett,
 Cornelius A. Pugsley,
 Josiah C. Pumpelly,
 Edward B. Rawson,
 Margaret H. Read,
 Mrs. C. G. Reed,
 William Ap Rees,
 L. O. Reeve,
 Rev. J. B. Remensnyder,
 Rev. A. H. Rennie,

Katherine T. Rhodes,
 Rev. L. C. Rich,
 Charles E. Ried,
 Julia F. Ring,
 John L. Roberts,
 Mrs. Rosalind Roberts,
 Hon. Beverly R. Robinson,
 Mrs. Cornelia S. Robinson,
 Wm. S. Robinson,
 J. Ella Rood,
 Jennie Rose,
 Isaac F. Russell,
 Hon. Ezra Rust,
 Michael Salit,
 L. W. Sanders,

Rev. Dr. E. B. Sanford,
 Florence M. Scales,
 Rev. Henry P. Schauffler,
 Mrs. S. B. Schenck,
 Mrs. Ida J. Schepmoes,
 Carl Schlegel,
 Helen Schlondorof,
 Rose Schneiderman,
 Hyman Schroeder,
 Mrs. N. J. Schwerin,
 Mrs. W. S. Searle,
 Seymour N. Sears,
 Martha I. Shaw,

Peoples' Institute.
 College Women's Club.
 New York City Mothers' Club.
 Manhattan College.
 Friends Church, Brooklyn.
 Broadway Friends Church.
 Legislature of New York.
 Chinatown Bowery Settlement for Girls.
 Carnegie Foundation.
 Sons of American Revolution.
 The League of Peace.
 Religious Society of Friends, Brooklyn.
 Women's Philharmonic Society.
 Colonial Dames of America.
 Welsh Presbyterian Church.
 First Free Baptist Church, Brooklyn.
 Lutheran Church.
 The Glenmore Avenue Presbyterian Church,
 Brooklyn.
 International Children's School Farm League.
 Corpus Christi Church.
 The North Side Board of Trade.
 Chiropcan Club, Brooklyn.
 Fifth Church of Christ, Scientist.
 Fifth Church of Christ, Scientist.
 State of New York.
 West End Republican Club.
 Third Church of Christ, Scientist, Brooklyn.
 Knickerbocker Relief Club.
 The Welcome House Settlement.
 American Social Science Association.
 Saginaw Board of Trade.
 Congregation Beth Israel.
 Young Men's Bible Class, Fifth Avenue Baptist Church.
 Inter-Church Conference.
 West Side Neighborhood House.
 Olivet Memorial Church.
 Women's Republican Association.
 First Church of Christ, Scientist, Brooklyn.
 Swedish Peace Society.
 Normal College.
 Equality League of Self-Supporting Women.
 Henry Street Settlement.
 The Bloomingdale Guild.
 Moravian Church, Brooklyn.
 Church of the Evangel, Brooklyn.
 The Bloomingdale Guild.

- Edwin R. A. Seligman,
 Elson W. Sheffield,
 Waldo H. Sherman,
 Mrs. Waldo H. Sherman,
 Rev. Joseph Silverman,
 Mrs. Mary K. Sinckovitch,
 Mrs. Frederick Smart,
 G. Waldo Smith,
- Mrs. M. Wright Smith,
 Rev. Thomas W. Smith,
 Mrs. L. McKee Smith,
 Mrs. Henry Smith,
 Mrs. Hannah P. Smith,
 Maurice F. Smith,
 Rev. George E. Smith,
 Dr. Wm. Benham Snow,
 Miss Sommerfeld,
 J. S. Sprague,
 Mrs. E. L. Stanley,
 Achille Starace,
 Mrs. Marie Starch,
 Laura A. Steel,
 John A. Stercher,
 Mrs. Leo Stein,
- J. M. Steinberg,
 Benjamin F. Stephens,
 Clinton Stephens,
 O. J. Stephens,
 Mrs. Augusta E. Stetson,
 W. C. Stinson,
 Franklin N. Stote,
 Mrs. Eliza Streicher,
 Solomon Sulzberger,
 Estella Sweet,
 Rev. C. M. Tallifson,
 Fred E. Tasker,
 Mrs. Edward Tatum,
 Rev. DeWitt B. Thompson,
 Mrs. Mary D. Thomas,
- Mrs. Edward Thorndike,
 Rev. Dr. Maurice Thorner,
 Emma Thursby,
 John B. Tillotson,
 Mrs. Helen B. Tillotson,
 Pacelli Tito,
- American Economic Association.
 Young Men's Christian Association.
 American League Citizenship Training.
 American League Citizenship Training.
 Temple Emanu-El.
 Greenwich House Settlement.
 Good Citizenship League, Flushing.
 N. Y. Board of Trade and Transportation,
 Bayside.
 Women's Republican Club.
 St. Nicholas Presbyterian Church.
 The Women's Club of Staten Island, Brighton.
 College Women's Club.
 Universal Peace Union.
 American Federation of Musicians.
 Methodist Protestant Church, Aqueduct, L. I.
 Medical Association for Prevention of War.
 Clara De Hirsch Home, for Working Girls.
 Fordham M. E. Church.
 State Republican Club.
 Italian Chamber of Commerce.
 Riverside Girls' Club.
 Greenpoint Settlement, Brooklyn.
 Leslie's Weekly.
 Philanthropic Committee Women's Conference.
 Congregation of B'nai Scholoum.
 The Brooklyn Public Library Ass'n, Brooklyn.
 The North Side Board of Trade.
 The North Side Board of Trade.
 First Church of Christ, Scientist.
 Dutch Reformed Church.
 System Magazine.
 Hartley House.
 Temple Bethel.
 The League of Peace, Brooklyn.
 Norwegian Lutheran Church, Brooklyn.
 West Side Young Men's Christian Association.
 Religious Society of Friends.
 Park Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church.
 New York County Woman's Christian Temperance Union.
 Jacob A. Riis Settlement.
 Temple Hand-in-Hand.
 Little Mothers Society.
 First Church of Christ, Scientist, S. I.
 Daughters of American Revolution.
 Rockmen's and Excavators' Union.

Raphael Tobias,
Rev. E. C. Tollifson,

Rev. William B. Tower,
George E. Townley,
Rev. H. A. Tupper,
Emily L. Tuckerman,
Charles Unangest,
Charles W. Underhill,
Mrs. Van Beil,
Mrs. S. C. Van Dusen,
Mrs. H. Van Sinderen,
M. J. Verdery,
W. G. Ver Planck,
Oswald G. Villard,
Mrs. Henry Villard,
John A. Voris,
John A. Wallace, Jr.,
Mrs. G. B. Wallis,

Mrs. William C. Walter,
George A. Walton,
Mrs. Leopold Wallach,
James K. Warnock,
Miss Waters,
Mrs. R. P. S. Webster,
Mrs. Robert Weil,
Paul G. Weitz,

Mrs. Ida Wells,
Rev. H. Leraia Wender,
Mrs. J. Wells Wentworth,
Miss K. Westendorf,
Mrs. Susanne L. Westfield,
Amoret T. Wetmore,
G. M. Whicher,
Horace White,
Rev. J. S. White,
S. V. White,
James Wiggins,
Mrs. Charlotte B. Wilbour,
Mabel Wilcox,
Laura G. Williams,
Martha McC. Williams,
Rev. Thomas Williams,

W. R. Wilson,
Mrs. H. J. Wood,

Sons of Veterans.

Bethlehem Norwegian Lutheran Church,
Brooklyn.

Fordham M. E. Church, Fordham.

Church of the Redeemer, Brooklyn.

15th Street Baptist Church, Brooklyn.

International Children's School Farm League.

St. James Lutheran Church.

Religious Society of Friends, Brooklyn.

Little Mothers' Aid Association.

City History Club.

International Children's School Farm League.

Reformed Church of Flushing, Flushing.

Geneva Political Equality Club.

New York City Peace Society.

New York State Suffrage Association.

Young Men's Christian Association.

Summerfield M. E. Church, Brooklyn.

Colonial Chapter Daughters of Revolution,
Brooklyn.

The Post Parliament, New Brighton.

General Conference of Friends.

Council of Jewish Women.

West End Presbyterian Church.

Henry Street Settlement.

N. Y. League of Unitarian Women, Brooklyn.

Council of Jewish Women.

Young Men's Christian Association, Second
Avenue Branch.

Professional Women's League.

The Spanish and Portuguese Congregation.

Business Women's League.

D. Y. N. T. House.

Professional Women's League.

West Side Neighborhood House.

Normal College, New York.

New York Peace Society.

The Neighborhood Workers' Ass'n of N. Y.

Marcus Monument, Ass'n, Brooklyn.

Madison Avenue Reformed Church.

Phalo Club.

School of Philanthropy.

Postal Progress League.

Tennessee Women's & Authors' Press Club.

Pilgrim Congregational Church, Richmond
Hill.

Grace M. P. Church.

Portia Club.

Mrs. W. H. Wood,
 Harry Woodward,
 Dr. Charles Wooley,
 Mrs. M. P. Woolcott,
 Rev. W. S. Woolworth,
 Mrs. W. S. Woolworth,
 Mrs. Wright,
 Mrs. John Yarrogen,
 Mrs. James Yereance,
 Mrs. J. Zimmerman,
 Antonia Zucca,

Business Women's League.
 Plymouth Church of Brooklyn, Brooklyn.
 The Nat'l Christian League, Brooklyn.
 Third Church of Christ, Scientist, Brooklyn.
 Clinton Ave. Congregational Church, Brooklyn.
 Clinton Ave. Congregational Church, Brooklyn.
 Asacog Settlement, Brooklyn.
 City Federation of Women's Clubs.
 League of Peace.
 Long Acre League.
 Italian Chamber of Commerce.

OKLAHOMA.

George H. Bradford,
 Lucy Gage,

Epworth University, Oklahoma City.
 Epworth University, Oklahoma City.

OHIO.

Mrs. S. A. Anderson,
 Rev. David Wasgatt Clark,
 Rev. H. H. Clark,
 J. G. W. Cowles,
 C. W. Dabney,
 Ella M. Haas,
 Ida M. Haas,
 T. H. Haines,
 Dr. Thomas P. Hart,
 William Christie Herron,
 Mrs. Wm. Christie Herron,
 Hon. John D. Higgins,
 Edna Hopkins,
 Charles S. Howe,
 Dr. Wm. G. Hubbard,
 J. A. Jeffrey,
 Hon. E. A. Jones,
 W. A. Mahony,
 P. V. N. Myers,
 Mrs. J. Peterson,
 Supt. R. E. Rayman,
 J. A. Shawan,
 O. A. Simpson,
 Andrew Squire,
 Mrs. Andrew Squire,
 J. W. Van Kirk,
 Joe N. Weber,
 Rev. E. Melville Wylie,

Civic Club, Akron.
 Cincinnati Peace Society, Cincinnati.
 City of Salem, Salem.
 Chamber of Commerce, Cleveland.
 Arbitration and Peace Society, Cincinnati.
 Women's Century Club, Dayton.
 Women's Century Club, Dayton.
 Ohio State University, Columbus.
 City of Cincinnati, Cincinnati.
 City of Cincinnati, Cincinnati.
 Cincinnati Women's Club, Cincinnati.
 City of Salem, Salem.
 Friends General Conference, Cincinnati.
 Case School Applied Science, Cleveland.
 American Peace Society, Columbus.
 Board of Trade, Columbus.
 Board of Trade, Columbus.
 Board of Trade, Columbus.
 Arbitration and Peace Society, Cincinnati.
 Civic Club, Akron.
 Ohio Supt. of Schools, East Liverpool.
 Board of Trade, Columbus.
 City of Salem, Salem.
 Ohio State Bar Association, Cleveland.
 Ohio State Bar Association, Cleveland.
 City of Mt. Vernon, N. Y., Youngstown.
 American Federation of Musicians, Cincinnati.
 Presbyterian Minister's Club, Cleveland.

PENNSYLVANIA.

- Mrs. A. H. Allen, United Daughters of Confederacy, Philadelphia.
- Rev. Matthew Anderson, Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia.
- Rev. A. S. Anspacher, City of Scranton, Scranton.
- Joshua L. Bailly, Friends Peace Association, Philadelphia.
- Rev. H. H. Barber, Meadville Theological School, Meadville.
- Frances E. Baright, Committee of Friends, Philadelphia.
- Congressman A. L. Bates, 25th Pennsylvania District, Meadville.
- Mrs. T. Ashby Blythe, United Daughters of Confederacy, Philadelphia.
- Elizabeth Powell Bond, Philanthropic Committee of Friends, Swarthmore.
- Clellan A. Bowman, Dean of Albright College, Meyerstown.
- Thomas B. Brown, Phila. Friends, Yearly Meeting, Westchester.
- R. K. Buehrle, School Dept. of Lancaster, Lancaster.
- George Burnham Jr., Trades League, Philadelphia.
- Walter Calley, Upland Baptist Church, Upland.
- Mrs. Walter Calley, Upland Baptist Church, Upland.
- J. B. Carlock, Lehigh University, South Bethlehem.
- Laura H. Carnell, Temple College, Philadelphia.
- Arabella Carter, Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia.
- Laning Coates, State of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Thomas Close, Central Labor Union, Plymouth.
- Henry C. Cochrane, City of Chester, Chester.
- Mrs. Emma Cooper, Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia.
- Rudolph I. Coffee, Tree of Life Congregation, Pittsburg.
- Matthew Coar, Technical High School, Scranton.
- C. W. F. Coffin, Franklin Public High School, Franklin.
- George R. Dabney, International Typographical Union, Pittsburg.
- Bishop J. H. Darlington, Episcopal Church, Harrisburg.
- L. M. Davis, First Church of Christ, Scientist, Towanda.
- Harold W. Davis, Scranton High School, Scranton.
- Pres. H. T. Drinker, Lehigh University, South Bethlehem.
- Mrs. H. T. Drinker, Lehigh University, South Bethlehem.
- Mrs. Sarah B. Flitcraft, Woman's Suffrage Association, Chester.
- Dr. Robert S. Friedman, Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia.
- Robert Good, Central Labor Union, Berwick.
- Rev. L. Y. Graham, Presbyterian Ministerial Ass'n, Philadelphia.
- Mrs. L. Y. Graham, Olivet Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.
- Mrs. S. Richardson Griffith, Pennsylvania Peace Society, Philadelphia.
- Cornelia Hancock, Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia.
- Hon. Alfred Hand, City of Scranton, Scranton.
- Walter W. Haviland, Philadelphia Peace Ass'n of Friends, Philadelphia.
- Samuel L. Hartman, Young Men's Christian Ass'n, Lancaster.
- J. W. Hays, International Typographical Union, Philadelphia.

- Lewis Heck,
 John P. Helfenstein,
 E. C. Helfenstein,
 Rt. Rev. Bishop Hoban,
 Guy W. Hodges,
 Mrs. Emilie R. Hoffman,
 G. W. Holt,
 Rev. William Hutton,
 Mrs. T. A. Janvier,
 T. D. Jones,
 N. B. Kelly,
 Patience W. Kent,
 Mr. Kniffen,
 Frank D. La Lanne,
 Rev. John Clarence Lee,
 S. McCune Lindsay,
 Alfred H. Love,
 Matthew Lynott,
 Eliphalet Oram Lyte,
 S. B. McCormick,
 Mrs. Edgar Marburg,
 Albert E. McKinley,
 Mrs. Albert E. McKinley,
 Pres. J. D. Moffatt,
 Rebecca Moore,
 Ledlie Moore,
 H. W. Palmer,
 Dr. G. M. Philips,
 Arthur J. Phillips,
 H. G. Prout,
 Francis Rawle,
 Pres. George Edward Reed,
 Mrs. George Edward Reed,
 Ellwood Roberts,
 Mrs. Ellwood Roberts,
 S. A. Rook,
 Nathan C. Schaeffer,
 Bertha Sellers,
 Garrett Spiers,
 R. B. Spicer,
 H. D. Smith,
 Lee S. Smith,
 Hugh Tormay,
- Lehigh University, South Bethlehem.
 City of Shamokin, Shamokin.
 City of Shamokin, Shamokin.
 City of Scranton, Scranton.
 Public High School, Scranton.
 Temple College, Philadelphia.
 Franklin Public High School, Franklin.
 Presbyterian Ministerial Ass'n, Philadelphia.
 Lehigh University, South Bethlehem.
 City of Hazleton, Hazleton.
 Trades League, Philadelphia.
 Women's Suffrage League, Swarthmore.
 Lehigh University, South Bethlehem.
 City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia.
 Pennsylvania Peace Society, Philadelphia.
 Amer. Academy of Political and Social Science,
 Philadelphia.
 Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia.
 Technical High School Scranton.
 State of Pennsylvania, Millersville.
 Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburg.
 United Daughters of Confederacy, Philadelphia.
 Temple College of Philadelphia, Germantown.
 Temple College of Philadelphia, Germantown.
 Washington and Jefferson College, Washington.
 Penn. Peace Society, Philadelphia.
 Lehigh University, South Bethlehem.
 General Committee, Wilkesbarre.
 State of Pennsylvania, West Chester.
 Public High School, Scranton.
 Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburg.
 Delegate at Large, Philadelphia.
 Dickinson College, Carlisle.
 Dickinson College, Carlisle.
 Philanthropic Com. of Phila, Norristown.
 Philanthropic Com. of Phila, Norristown.
 Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburg.
 City of Harrisburg, Harrisburg.
 The Swarthmore First Day School, Swarthmore.
 Lehigh University, South Bethlehem.
 Genl. Conference of Friends Ass'n, Philadelphia.
 Lehigh University, South Bethlehem.
 Chamber of Commerce, Pittsburg.
 Central Labor Union, Plymouth.

Maud Thompson,	Pennsylvania Peace Society, Philadelphia.
Pres. M. Carey Thomas,	Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr.
Ethelbert D. Warfield,	Lafayette College, Easton.
Mrs. Elizabeth H. Webster,	Universal Peace Union, Philadelphia.
Mrs. M. S. Wetherell,	Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Philadelphia.
Henry W. Wilbur,	Pilgrim's Society of Friends, Swarthmore.
Mrs. Mary E. Wilson,	First Church of Christ, Scientist, Franklin.
Mrs. M. R. Williams,	Philadelphia Peace Society, Philadelphia.
J. D. Wooding,	Albright College, Myerstown.
Stanley R. Yarnall,	Peace Ass'n of Friends, Germantown.
Anna Rice Powell,	Phila. Com. of Friends, Philadelphia.

RHODE ISLAND.

Cyrus R. Aldrich,	Pawtucket Women's Suffrage, E. Providence.
Sarah M. Aldrich,	Pawtucket Women's Suffrage, E. Providence.
James H. Chase,	Rhode Island Peace Society, Providence.
Mrs. James H. Chase,	Rhode Island Peace Society, Providence.
Mary K. Conyngton,	Rhode Island Peace Society, Providence.
Mrs. A. Cook Dewing,	Rhode Island Peace Society, Providence.
Mrs. Geo. D. Gladding,	Local Council of Rhode Island, Providence.
Robert A. Kenyon,	City of Pawtucket, Pawtucket.
Thomas Park,	City of Pawtucket, Pawtucket.
Charles Sisson,	Rhode Island Peace Society, Providence.
Mrs. Charles Sisson,	Rhode Island Peace Society, Providence.
Rev. A. S. Wicks,	City of Pawtucket, Pawtucket.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

John J. Dargan,	State Teachers' Association, Statesburg.
B. W. Montgomery,	South Carolina United Daughters Confederacy, Marion.
Mrs. W. O. Southard,	John Hames Chapter United Daughters Confederacy, Jonesville.

TENNESSEE.

Rev. G. B. Winton,	Christian Advocate, Nashville.
Rabbi Theodore F. Joseph,	Mizpah Congregation, Chattanooga.

TEXAS.

Charles H. Silliman,	First Baptist Church, Ft. Worth.
S. P. Brooks,	Baylor University, Waco.

UTAH.

John P. Méakin,	State of Utah, Salt Lake City.
J. M. Sjodahl,	"Deseret News," Salt Lake City.

VERMONT.

Joseph Auld,
I. M. Bregstein,
Rev. F. L. Bullard,

L. Bart Crass,
Joseph A. DeBoer,
Rev. Edward D. Eaton,
M. W. Messer,
Rev. H. R. Miles,
Rev. Wm. J. O'Sullivan,
Clarence H. Senter,
Albert Tuttle,

State of Vermont, Burlington.
City of Burlington, Burlington.
Rutland Conferences of Congregational
Churches, Brandon.
City of Montpelier, Montpelier.
City of Montpelier, Montpelier.
North Congregational Church, St. Johnsbury.
Unitarian Church, Windsor.
Centre Congregational Church, Brattleboro.
City of Montpelier, Montpelier.
City of Montpelier, Montpelier.
City of Montpelier, Montpelier.

VIRGINIA.

Harris Hart,
Wyndham R. Meredith,
A. J. Montague,

Rev. R. A. Robinson,
William W. Smith,

City of Roanoke, Roanoke.
Virginia League of Peace, Richmond.
Virginia League for International Arbitration,
Richmond.
City of Norfolk, Norfolk.
Delegate at Large, Lynchburg.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Thomas H. Anderson,
Charles Henry Butler,
Mrs. Marion Butler,
Mrs. George K. Gaulding,
Samuel Gompers,
Rev. Edward Everett Hale,
William L. Hall,
E. M. Hawley,

J. B. Henderson, Jr.,
Miss Hill,
Archibald Hopkins,
Belva A. Lockwood,
Mrs. E. Clark Morgan,

Pres. Charles W. Needham,
Thomas Nelson Page,
Mrs. Arthur Ramsey,
Rabbi Abram Simon,
Cotton Smith,
A. H. Snow,
Robert Stein,
Herbert Wadsworth,
H. E. Warner,

Local Organization of Washington.
Washington Conciliation Society.
United Daughters of Confederacy.
United Daughters of Confederacy.
American Federation of Labor.
Peace Society of Washington.
American Forestry Association.
Diplomacy School of George Washington
University.
International Arbitration Treaty Conference.
League of American Pen Women.
Washington Peace Conference.
Universal Peace Union.
District of Columbia Federation of Women
Clubs.
George Washington University.
International Arbitration Treaty Conference.
Twentieth Century Club.
City of Washington.
City of Washington.
Washington Peace Association.
Universal Peace Union.
City of Washington.
Local Resident Com. of Arbitration Peace
Conference.

WISCONSIN.

Minnie Bradley,
Mrs. Wm. H. Crosby,

Woman's Club, Racine.
Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs, Ra-
cine.
American Economic Association, Madison.
St. Andrews Society of Milwaukee, Milwaukee.
The School Philanthropy, Oshkosh.

Richard T. Ely,
H. T. Ferguson,
James Jenkins,

WYOMING.

Mrs. Etta M. Roach,

"Laramie Republic," Laramie.

FOREIGN DELEGATES.

Alexis Aladin,

Parliamentary Group of Second Russian
Duma; Special Envoy to the International
Peace Conference held in House of Com-
mons, England, 1906, Russia.

A. B. Barthe,
Justice Fitzgerald,
Mrs. Fitzgerald,
H. E. Irwin, K.C.,

Secolo, Milan.
City of Charlottetown, P. E. I., Canada.
City of Charlottetown, P. E. I., Canada.
Canadian Peace and Arbitration Society,
Toronto, Canada.

Miss E. Rundblad,

Swedish Peace Society, Orebro, Sweden.



E. J. Hall
1914

PROP. JOHN BASSETT MOORE
HENRY M. LEIPZIGER

PROP. GEORGE W. KIRCHWEY
MARCUS M. MARKS
H. C. PHILLIPS

PROP. SAMUEL T. DUTTON
MRS. ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
MISS MARY J. PIERSON

EDWIN D. MEAD
CHARLES SPRAGUE SMITH
HAYNE DAVIS

REV. JENKIN LLOYD JONES
JOHN E. MILHOLLAND

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

MAHLON N. KLINE
STANLEY R. YARNELL

HAMILTON HOLT
REV. FREDERICK LYNCH
DR. ERNST RICHARD

ROBERT ERSKINE ELY
MRS. FREDERICK NATHAN
DR. BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD
MRS. HENRY VILLARD

GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY
JAMES B. REYNOLDS
RALPH M. EASLEY

WILLIAM CHRISTIE HERRON
DR. J. LEONARD LEVY

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE



